

An Examination of I Timothy 3:16b:
Its Form, Language and Historical Background

by

Paul B. Fowler

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Divinity
University of Edinburgh
in Partial Fulfilment
of the Requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

1973



ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate Paul Bucher Fowler
Address _____
Degree Ph.D. Date February, 1973.
Title of Thesis An Examination of I Timothy 3:16b: Its Form, Language
and Historical Background

This study addresses itself to the interpretation of I Timothy 3.16b. In the past, interpretations have varied widely, and the purpose of this endeavor is to bring some order to this present state of confusion.

The procedure is to examine successively its form, language and historical background. Each aspect comprises a chapter which includes an introduction 'concerning problem and method', a basic analysis and a conclusion.

Chapter I, 'An Analysis of Form', attempts to answer the following three questions:

- 1) Is there ample justification for viewing I Timothy 3.16b as an inserted Christian tradition?
- 2) If so, then what was the nature of this prior form? Was it a hymn, a confession, or what?
- 3) What is the structure of this form, and are there any unique features which may help in the interpretation of it?

It is concluded 1) that the answer to the first question is in the affirmative; 2) that the passage may have been used as a hymn at an earlier date, but that it is better to think of it generally in terms of a 'Bekenntnislied' due to the presence of confessional elements; 3) that the form is structured according to a 3x2 arrangement which further exhibits a chiasmic antithetical parallelism contrasting two spheres of existence. These features assist in the interpretation of the passage.

In Chapter II, 'An Analysis of Language', an attempt is made to define the meaning of the words and phrases. In view of the numerous possible interpretations, it is preferable to consider the lines as couplets rather than as individual units and to use the results of the analysis of form. Only in this way is it possible to reach some unanimity in interpretation. The following meaning of the lines is tentatively suggested by the present writer:

(concerning Jesus Christ, who)

was the revelation of the divine in the realm of flesh,
was subsequently vindicated by God in the realm of spirit,
was presented (appeared) to the 'spirit-powers',
was presented (proclaimed) to the unbelieving nations,
was received by all mankind in faith,
was received by all supernatural beings in submission and
worship.)

Though the aorist tense is consistently used throughout the form, the lines do not refer to specific events in the life of Christ, but to the 'consequence' of his earthly and post-resurrection existence. Hence, the verbs may be viewed as 'complexive' (constative) and/or 'perfective' and/or 'gnomic' aorists, depending on the individual statements.

Chapter III, 'An Analysis of Historical Background', is largely a religio-historical study. Scholars have suggested various schemata and/or backgrounds which may have contributed to the provenance of the form. We shall be looking principally at the following views:

1. an Egyptian coronation ceremony (J. Jeremias)
2. the Gnostic Redeemer-myth (R. Bultmann)
3. the 'divine man' concept (R.H. Fuller)
4. Hellenistic-spatial concepts (E. Schweizer)
5. Judaic-spatial concepts (W. Stenger)
6. Palestinian-Judaic & 'descensus ad inferos' (R.H. Gundry).

These considerations lead to the conclusion that I Timothy 3.16b cannot be viewed as derived from any one of the several suggested schemes and that the form should not be categorized as either 'Judaic' or 'Hellenistic'. Rather, it would appear that the author is debtor to both traditions in view of the syncretism of the first century A.D. and in view of the presence in the form of features generally accepted as characteristic of both environments. He may have had a Jewish background, but was concerned in this passage to convey the Gospel to the wider world of Hellenism. This accounts for the absence of a 'theology of the cross' and the presence of a 'theology of cosmic triumph'.

One cannot be more precise with regard to the original Sitz im Leben of the form, or its specific author. Its date of composition is late in comparison to the Jerusalem kerygma and such forms as I Cor. 15.3ff., but obviously prior to I Timothy. The 'order of the lines' is due to a combination of factors: a) the nature of the form; b) the general theme of the exaltation of Christ; c) the use of the aorist tense which places emphasis on the soteriological significance of the statements; d) above all, the concern of a Christian believer who wished to express with confidence that hope which the Hellenistic Christian community possessed in the resurrected/exalted Christ.

ABSTRACT

This study addresses itself to the interpretation of I Timothy 3.16b. In the past, interpretations have varied widely, and the purpose of this endeavor is to bring some order to this present state of confusion.

The procedure is to examine successively its form, language and historical background. Each aspect comprises a chapter which includes an introduction 'concerning problem and method', a basic analysis and a conclusion.

Chapter I, 'An Analysis of Form', attempts to answer the following three questions:

- 1) Is there ample justification for viewing I Timothy 3.16b as an inserted Christian tradition?
- 2) If so, then what was the nature of this prior form? Was it a hymn, a confession, or what?
- 3) What is the structure of this form, and are there any unique features which may help in the interpretation of it?

It is concluded 1) that the answer to the first question is in the affirmative; 2) that the passage may have been used as a hymn at an earlier date, but that it is better to think of it generally in terms of a 'Bekenntnislied' due to the presence of confessional elements; 3) that the form is structured according to a 3x2 arrangement which further exhibits a chiastic antithetical parallelism contrasting two spheres of existence. These features assist in the interpretation of the passage.

In Chapter II, 'An Analysis of Language', an attempt is made to define the meaning of the words and phrases. In view of the numerous possible interpretations, it is preferable to consider the lines as couplets rather than as individual units and to use the results of the analysis of form. Only in this way is it possible to reach some unanimity in interpretation. The following meaning of the lines is tentatively suggested by the present writer:

(concerning Jesus Christ, who)
 was the revelation of the divine in the realm of flesh,
 was subsequently vindicated by God in the realm of spirit,
 was presented (appeared) to the 'spirit-powers',
 was presented (proclaimed) to the unbelieving nations,
 was received by all mankind in faith,
 was received by all supernatural beings in submission and
 worship.

Though the aorist tense is consistently used throughout the form, the lines do not refer to specific events in the life of Christ, but to the 'consequence' of his earthly and post-resurrection existence. Hence, the verbs may be viewed as 'complexive' (constative) and/or 'perfective' and/or 'gnomic' aorists, depending on the individual statements.

Chapter III, 'An Analysis of Historical Background', is largely a religio-historical study. Scholars have suggested various schemata and/or backgrounds which may have contributed to the provenance of the form. We shall be looking principally at the following views:

1. an Egyptian coronation ceremony (J. Jeremias)
2. the Gnostic Redeemer-myth (R. Bultmann)
3. the 'divine man' concept (R.H. Fuller)
4. Hellenistic-spatial concepts (E. Schweizer)

5. Judaic-spatial concepts (W. Stenger)

6. Palestinian-Judaic & 'descensus ad inferos' (R.H. Gundry).

These considerations lead to the conclusion that I Timothy 3.16b cannot be viewed as derived from any one of the several suggested schemes and that the form should not be categorized as either 'Judaic' or 'Hellenistic'. Rather, it would appear that the author is debtor to both traditions in view of the syncretism of the first century A.D. and in view of the presence in the form of features generally accepted as characteristic of both environments. He may have had a Jewish background, but was concerned in this passage to convey the Gospel to the wider world of Hellenism. This accounts for the absence of a 'theology of the cross' and the presence of a 'theology of cosmic triumph'.

One cannot be more precise with regard to the original Sitz im Leben of the form, or its specific author. Its date of composition is late in comparison to the Jerusalem kerygma and such forms as I Cor. 15.3ff., but obviously prior to I Timothy. The 'order of the lines' is due to a combination of factors: a) the nature of the form; b) the general theme of the exaltation of Christ; c) the use of the aorist tense which places emphasis on the soteriological significance of the statements; d) above all, the concern of a Christian believer who wished to express with confidence that hope which the Hellenistic Christian community possessed in the resurrected/exalted Christ.

PREFACE

I wish to acknowledge those who have encouraged and assisted me in this present study. I am indeed grateful to Professor H. Anderson for his patience, counsel and constructive criticism throughout the entire enterprise. Dr. I. Moir and Prof. R.A.S. Barbour (King's College, Aberdeen) read the draft, and I do appreciate their painstaking criticism and invaluable advice. I am also grateful to J.V. Howard, I.G. Hope and the rest of the staff of New College Library for their willing assistance in locating books and reference information, and to Mrs. Williams for her cheerfulness and ability in typing the manuscript.

Without the financial assistance of the late Mr. J. Howard Pew and of my parents, this undertaking would not have been possible.

Finally, I wish to record my awareness of the personal sacrifices which members of my family have been called upon to make. I am especially grateful to my mother and late father for their love and devotion in backing me all the way. Above all, I am immeasurably indebted to my loving wife whose sacrifice has been very real during these long days of study. It is with this in mind that this thesis is dedicated to my wife, Camma, and to my mother and father, without whose help and encouragement this study would never have been completed.

P.B.F.
Edinburgh.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract	ii
Preface	v
Table of Contents	vi
Abbreviations	viii
<hr/>	
INTRODUCTION	1
I. An Analysis of Form.	9
A. Concerning Problem and Method.	9
B. The Basic Analysis.	10
C. Conclusion.	71
II. An Analysis of Language.	74
A. Concerning Problem and Method.	74
B. The Basic Analysis.	86
1. <u>ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί</u> <u>ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι</u>	86
2. <u>ὥφθη ἀγγέλοις</u> <u>ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν</u>	143
3. <u>ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ</u> <u>ἀνελημφθη ἐν δόξῃ</u>	161
C. Conclusion.	169
III. An Analysis of Historical Background	179
A. Concerning Problem and Method	179

Page

B. The Basic Analysis.	200
1. J. Jeremias - an Egyptian coronation ceremony.	200
2. R. Bultmann - the Gnostic Redeemer-myth.	209
3. R.H. Fuller - divine man concept.	223
4. E. Schweizer - Hellenistic-spatial concepts.	232
5. W. Stenger - Judaic-spatial concepts.	241
6. R.H. Gundry - Palestinian-Judaic & 'descensus ad inferos'.	248
C. Conclusion.	264
CONCLUSION	268
<hr/>	
Excursus I	284
Excursus II	291
Bibliography	293

ABBREVIATIONS

ATR	Anglican Theological Review
BBC	The Broadman Bible Commentary
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
CBQ	The Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CBS	The Century Bible Series
EGT	The Expositor's Greek Testament
EQ	Evangelical Quarterly
ET	The Expository Times
EvTh	Evangelische Theologie
H-CzNT	Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
HUAC	Hebrew Union College Annual
IB	The Interpreter's Bible
ICC	The International Critical Commentary
IDB	The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JEA	Journal of Egyptian Archaeology
JTS	The Journal of Theological Studies
MNTC	The Moffatt New Testament Commentary
NCB	New Century Bible
NCBS	New Clarendon Bible Series
NLC	The New London Commentary on the New Testament
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsche
NTS	New Testament Studies
RGG	Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vols. I-VII, edd. G. Kittel & G. Friedrich, trans. G.W. Bromiley.
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
TWNT	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Vols. VIII-IX, edd. G. Kittel & G. Friedrich.
WC	Westminster Commentaries
ZNW	Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZTK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

It is assumed that the other abbreviations not listed here but found in the text and footnotes are common enough not to need clarification.

Biblical quotations in English are from the American Revised Standard Version, except where otherwise indicated.

The standard for spelling, hyphenating and capitalizing is Webster's New International Dictionary.

When a source is quoted more than once in a chapter, only the first reference will include the details of place and date.

INTRODUCTION

Because of the recent increase of discussion with reference to the form, meaning and background of I Timothy 3.16b(I.3.16b), and because of the work of such scholars as A. Seeberg and E. Norden who largely pioneered the study of catechetical and liturgical forms to be found in the New Testament, it might be supposed that the study of I.3.16b as a primitive Christian hymn or confession is strictly a twentieth century phenomenon. It was, therefore, surprising to find the following statement written in 1844 by W.M.L. de Wette:¹

"Dieses Geh. [Geheimnis] wird nun angegeben, aber offenbar, weil die Sätze zum Theil undeutlich und beziehungslos sind, in fremden einem christlichen Gesänge...oder einer Bekenntniss-Formel entlehnten Worten. Es sind Parallelsätze, und zwar gehören immer zwei, die einen Gegensatz bilden,...und der Gegensatz ist jedes Mal umgekehrt...und die Stellung desselben ans Ende hat darin ihren Grund, dass irdische...und himmlische Verherrlichung in Parallele gestellt sind."

To appreciate this statement, it is only necessary to read what E. Schweizer, writing approximately 120 years after de Wette, has written:²

"A lengthy exegetical study has resulted in the conclusion that this is an early Christian hymn to be divided into 3 couplets...The structure... is wholly dominated by a spatial pattern of heaven and earth which is expressed in a threefold chiasmus, as we find quite often in Hebraic literature."

-
1. Kurze Erklärung der Briefe an Titus, Timotheus und die Hebräer, Leipzig, 1844, pp. 87f. [The apparent errors in spelling in this and other older German quotations which follow in the 'Introduction' are due to early 19th century usage.]
 2. "Two New Testament Creeds Compared", Neotestamentica, Zürich/Stuttgart, 1963, pp. 125f.

Nor was de Wette the first scholar in Germany to make such an interpretation. He was preceded by scholars like A.L.C. Heydenreich, J.F. von Flatt, F.C. Baur, M.J. Mack and C. St. Matthies, all of whom supposed "daß die Sätze einem alten christlichen Gesange oder einer Bekenntnißformal entnommen seien."³

Other German scholars⁴ continued this line of study

3. Heydenreich, Die Pastoralbriefe Pauli, Hadamar, 1826, pp. 206ff; von Flatt, Vorlesungen über die Briefe Pauli an den Timotheus und Titus, Tübingen, 1831, p. 95n.; Baur, Die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus, Stuttgart, 1835, pp. 28-33; Mack, Commentar über die Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus, Tübingen, 1836, pp. 296ff; Matthies, Erklärung der Pastoralbriefe, Greifswald, 1840, pp. 320ff. The quotation is from J.C.K. von Hofmann, Die Briefe Pauli an Titus und Timotheus, Nördlingen, 1874, pp. 123ff.
4. The following quotations and aspects of 19th century study of I.3.16 are of particular interest. In his 1865 commentary, A. Bisping (Erklärung der drei Pastoralbriefe und des Briefes an Philemon, Münster, 1865) comments at length on the possibility of I.3.16b being a hymn: "Der ganze rhythmische Bau dieser kurzen Sätze und der Parallelismus, der immer zwischen je zwei Gliedern, die sich einander gegenüberstehen, stattfindet, spricht für diese Voraussetzung." Then, after referring to Eph. 5.19; Col. 3.16; a report of Eusebius (H.E.5,28) and the letter of Pliny to Trajan, both of which refer to the songs of praise sung to Christ as God, Bisping makes these further observations: "Aus einem solchen Wechselgesang (Responsorium, Antiphon) ist nun auch wahrscheinlich diese Stelle genommen. Man wendet zwar gegen diese Annahme ein, es sei in diesen Worten kein hoher poetischer Schwung bemerklich, dann sei es auch unwahrscheinlich, daß Paulus grade ein solches Lied benutzt habe, um das Hauptthema der evangelischen Lehre in wenigen Worten anzugeben. Allein in Kirchenliedern, zumal in dogmatischen, welche die Stelle eines Glaubenssymbols vertreten sollen, ist ein hoher poetischer Schwung nicht zu erwarten, ja würde da ganz am unrechten Orte angebracht sein." J.E. Huther (Kritisch Exegetisches Handbuch über die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus, Göttingen, 1866) is to be remembered as having suggested a different structure of I.3.16b instead of the accepted threefold parallelism: "Richtiger ist es deshalb, das Ganze in zwei Haupttheile zu trennen, deren jeder drei Glieder hat, von denen je die beiden ersten das was sich auf der Erde, der dritte was sich im Himmel zugetragen, hervorheben." (p. 164) It is to be noted that the

[Contd.]

and before the turn of the century, many of the questions about I.3.16b which are of concern today were already being debated in depth:

4. Contd.]

commentaries in the latter half of the 19th century, including those by Bisping and Huther, appear to be longer and more involved with the linguistic and formal problems of our text than those written since the turn of the century. To demonstrate the depth to which some of the commentators went, we can use as an example excerpts from a discussion on the structure of I.3.16b by J.T. Beck (Erklärung der zwei Briefe Pauli an Timotheus, Gütersloh, 1879), whose discussion of I.3.16b covers sixteen pages: "Die ganze Periode zerfällt in drei Paare paralleler Sätze, wovon einer zum andern einen Gegensatz bildet, und in jedem Paar ist der Gegensatz umgekehrt... (continues by showing a chiasmic arrangement between visible and invisible realms)... αἶψά, ἔθνη, κόσμος gehören Einer Begriffssphäre an, in welcher αἶψά das Princip und Grundwesen ist;... (continues with explanation of statement)... Ebenso πνεῦμα, ἄγγελοι, δόξα bilden wieder fortschreitende Momente einer Reihe, deren Princip und Wesen das πνεῦμα ist;... (another clarification continues)... Es ist sichtlich, wenn wir beide Seiten zusammenhalten, eine Vereinigung von Ausserem und Innerem, Sichtbarem und Unsichtbarem, Unten und Oben gezeichnet... (concludes) Es liegt also eine sehr präzise und umsichtige logische und grammatische Beziehung in den einzelnen Worten und in der ganzen Satzstruktur, daher es eine oberflächliche Conjectur ist, das Ganze aus einem Hymnus oder aus einer Bekenntnisformel abzuleiten" (p. 159). [The Greek in this quotation is that found in Beck's text.]

British scholars as a whole in the 19th century were not receptive to the idea that I.3.16b represents a primitive Christian hymn or confession. Some well-known commentaries (G. D'Oly and R. Mant, The Holy Bible, Cambridge, 1830, ad loc.; T. Scott, The Holy Bible, London, 1844, pp. 3M7-8; M. Henry, An Exposition of the Old and New Testament, London, 1846, pp. 553-4; A Rowland, The First Letter of Paul the Apostle to Timothy, London, 1887, pp. 152-6) do not even present this possibility. H. Alford (The Greek Testament, III, London, 1856, p. 334) and P. Fairbairn (The Pastoral Epistles, Edinburgh, 1874, pp. 163f.) refer to the German discussion of this idea, but consider it improbable. However, C.J. Ellicott (A Critical and Grammatical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, London, 1856, p. 50) acknowledges the probability of its hymnodic character; also F.C. Cook, The Holy Bible, III (4 Vols.), London, 1881, p. 778; H.D.M. Spence, "The Epistles to Timothy and Titus", A New Testament Commentary for English Readers, Vol. III, ed. C.J. Ellicott, London, 1882, p. 194.

For a more detailed discussion of the 19th century interpretation of I.3.16b, infra, Chapter I, B, 3.

- What is the basic structure of the pericope?
 What content are we to give such words as αἰψ,
πνεῦμα, etc.?
 To what extent does the contrast between earth and
 heaven have to do with the interpretation of
 the pericope?
 What is the background of the pericope?
 How does the pericope relate to the context of
 I Timothy?

Thus, before becoming involved in the 20th century discussion of our text, it is important to acknowledge and accept the significant contributions of these scholars who pioneered the study of I.3.16b as a primitive Christian hymn or confession in the 19th century.

After the turn of the century, two significant discussions were written on I.3.16b, the first by A. Seeberg in his book Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit (1903),⁵ and the second by E. Norden in his book Agnostos Theos (1913).⁶ A. Seeberg's discussion is marked not so much by originality as by its depth of involvement in the problems raised by 19th century scholarship; and his conclusions are the result of a careful appraisal of the evidence presented prior to his time. More original, perhaps, is the work of E. Norden who is not afraid to question the results of previous analyses, including Seeberg's. Moreover, by approaching I.3.16b from a 'religionsgeschichtlicher Gesichtspunkt' (together with M. Dibelius),⁷ he has challenged more recent

5. Reprinted in München, 1966, pp. 112-125.

6. Reprinted in Darmstadt, 1971, cf. pp. 254ff. For a brief summary of both Seeberg's and Norden's work, see R. Deichgräber's historical summary (Gottes hymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit, Göttingen, 1967, pp. 12-14).

7. This approach is especially evident in his later work, Die Geburt des Kindes (1924), reprinted in Darmstadt, 1969, pp. 116-128.) This was preceded by M. Dibelius' important commentary, Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus (HzNT), Tübingen, 1913, pp. 164f.

scholarship to be more exact in its consideration of the form and background of the pericope.

Thus, the scene was set for a number of contributions to the study of I.3.16b. These have been forthcoming in the forms of commentaries and essays, though not as many as might have been expected. Although they have been asking many of the same questions initiated in the 19th century, they have been raising new questions and have been demanding more exhaustive answers in the light of more recent studies in form, linguistic and historical criticism (esp. Religionsgeschichte).

Nevertheless, at present, no major work has been written with a view to exploring comprehensively the form, meaning and background of this verse. In 1954 a thesis was written by O.R.B. Wilson at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary entitled "A Study of the Early Christian Credal Hymn of I Timothy 3:16."⁸ But it left untouched many of the questions now being raised in more critical discussion. Nor can any of the more recent essays be thought of as filling this need. For while they are useful in providing a variety of questions and interpretations, they are too brief and general in character to be expected to take into

8. An unpublished doctoral thesis submitted in January 1954. There is also an unpublished doctoral thesis which was written in Rome in 1956 by R.A. Braun which is more of a study in patristics as its title suggests: "Mysterium Pietatis seu in historiam interpretationis Eusebeias vocis Pastoralium Epistolarum, speciatim I Tim. 3, 16a inquisitio atque exegetica christologici hymni I Tim. 3, 16b explanatio" (Diss. Pontificii Inst. Biblici, Romae, 1956, xxxviii). The more devotional study of H.A. Blair might also be mentioned, A Creed Before the Creeds, London, 1955, which has some interesting insights.

account all the issues involved. Moreover, the variety of perspectives and the general lack of agreement which an assessment of these essays reveals, suggest that it is time for a more comprehensive study of I.3.16b which will attempt to bring some order to this present state of confusion.

The procedure for this study will be as follows: first it will relate to the more external questions of style and structure, second to the meaning of the specific terms and phrases used, and third to the quest of the probable background of the verse. Hence, the headings of the chapters:

- I. An Analysis of Form
- II. An Analysis of Language
- III. An Analysis of History

Each chapter will be subdivided into three parts: an introduction concerned with the problems of the analysis and the methods by which attempts may be made to solve them, the basic analysis, and the conclusions of that analysis. The thesis will end with a general conclusion.

The justification for this procedure, in general,⁹ lies in the principle that the procedure should lead from the comparatively simple to the complex, from areas of more agreement to less agreement, from problems where pre-suppositions become less of a factor to more of a factor. In this respect, the analysis of history would seem to

9. Justification for this procedure will be given in more detail below in the separate chapters: see pp. 9f., 28f., 41ff., 72f., 86f., 169ff., 198ff., 268ff.

qualify as the most complex of the three approaches; for there is very little agreement among scholars as to the background of I.3.16b, and their conclusions are inevitably conditioned to some extent by their presuppositions. To even begin to approach the ideal of an unbiased critical evaluation of the evidence, which could possibly lead to a correct analysis of the form's history, it is essential first to be well-informed concerning the problems of form and language and to have reached some conclusions concerning them. But which comes first, the formal or linguistic analysis? Either way some difficulty will be encountered because in both cases one will always want to be referring forward to material which is coming later.¹⁰ However, a survey of the main essays and commentaries suggests that the formal considerations would be the less complex of the two alternatives. There is more agreement among scholars as to the nature and structure of I.3.16b than about its meaning; and there is reason to suppose that the influence of presuppositions could be held to a minimum by carefully following certain accepted rules of literary criticism. Moreover, by placing the analysis of form prior to that of language, it is possible to raise certain basic questions at the outset of the thesis which relate to the nature of the passage to be analyzed, questions which would logically

10. On the one hand, there will be many points where the formal analysis will depend upon the meaning of the phrases involved. On the other hand, it is an impossible task to determine which of several possible interpretations of each phrase in I.3.16b was meant by the author if there are no literary guidelines to follow.

precede any intensive investigation of its meaning and history. Also, an analysis of the structure of I.3.16b would enable an historical survey of its interpretation to be included: This would be an invaluable guide for the latter analyses.

In Chapter I, the analysis of form is bound to be a little artificial, since at so many points it must depend upon material which will be discussed in depth in the other two chapters. Therefore, the conclusions of Chapter I will need to be constantly re-examined in the light of the following linguistic and historical analyses. But it is hoped that by following this procedure, all the major questions of I.3.16b can be studied in an order appropriately curtailing the number of presuppositions often haunting such a study, and progressively introducing those problems which need to be discussed at the proper time.

I. AN ANALYSIS OF FORM

A. Concerning Problem and Method.

The analysis of form will consist only of that aspect of literary criticism which pertains to the questions of style and structure of I.3.16b. The problems of such an analysis are not as acute and far-reaching as those to follow in the linguistic and historical analyses. Nevertheless, they have priority for several reasons. First, it is a good rule to begin critical research in an area where common ground can be found. It is the belief of this writer that the formal problems of this passage are not insurmountable and that general agreement may be reached with reference to its form. Second, in contrast to the analyses of language and history which follow, this formal analysis will require fewer presuppositions by its students, viz. with a brief text and certain accepted rules of literary criticism, objective analysis is (to a reasonable extent) possible. Third, a formal analysis raises basic questions, questions which should be discussed before any intensive research into the language and history of I.3.16b is attempted.

The problems which are confronted in a formal analysis of I.3.16b may be grouped into three questions which will be analyzed in the same sequence as they appear here. 1) Most recent scholars agree that I.3.16b is part of an earlier tradition which the author of I Timothy inserted in its present place in the letter. Is there sufficient justification for this view? 2) If the answer to the first question is affirmative, then what was the nature of this form prior

to its insertion in the epistle? Was it a hymn, a creedal statement, or what? 3) Finally, what is the particular structure of this inserted form, and are there any unique features which may help in the interpretation of it?

The method will be to use the regular tools of literary criticism just as would be the case for any other piece of poetry or poetic prose; and these tools will be stated at the beginning of each discussion. It should be observed at the outset that this task has been simplified by the recent work of E. Stauffer, R.P. Martin, G. Schille, R. Deichgräber and J.T. Sanders, all of whom will be referred to frequently in the pages to follow.¹

B. The Basic Analysis.

1. Scholars today view I.3.16 as containing a traditional Christological confession or hymn. In doing so, they have followed the lead of scholars (such as A.L.C. Heydenreich, J.F. von Flatt, et al.) dating back approximately 150 years. But is it so certain that I.3.16b is, in fact, an inserted traditional pericope from the Early Church?

A. Seeberg identified this passage as "die Glaubensformel und der Hymnus",² and E. Norden found in this text a

-
1. E. Stauffer, New Testament Theology, trans. J. Marsh, London, 1955, pp. 338f; R.P. Martin, "Aspects of Worship in the New Testament Church", Vox Evangelica, II, London, 1963, pp. 6ff.; G. Schille, Frühchristliche Hymnen, Berlin, 1965; R. Deichgräber, Gottes hymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit, Göttingen, 1967; J.T. Sanders, The New Testament Christological Hymns, Cambridge, 1971.
 2. Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit, München, 1966 (originally 1903), p. 112.

"liturgische Bekenntnisformel".³ Both scholars were pioneers of the more recent study of early Christian traditional material. Since their work, other scholars have helped to further the understanding of the procedure by which one may ascertain what elements of the New Testament are inserted traditional material.⁴ Of particular importance in this regard are the discussions of E. Stauffer in Appendix III of his New Testament Theology entitled "Twelve Criteria of Creedal Formulae in the New Testament,"⁵ and of G. Schille in the introductory chapter of his Frühchristliche Hymnen entitled "Zur Methodik der Arbeit."⁶ Both discussions furnish valuable lists of the criteria to be used in detecting traditional formulae in the New Testament. The following is a compendium of their lists shortened and rearranged in sequence and outline to help in the continuing analysis:

A. Contextual dislocation:

1. Formulae are often introduced by specific words or phrases.
2. Formulae make common use of relative clauses and participial predications.

-
3. Agnostos Theos, Darmstadt, 1971 (originally 1913), p. 255.
 4. For an interesting account of the history of investigation of the traditional material in Scripture, cf. R. Deichgraeber, Op.Cit., pp. 11-23. One may also turn, very profitably, to the unpublished Th.D. thesis of I-Jin Loh (A Study of an Early Christian Hymn in II Tim. 2:11-13, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1968, Princeton, New Jersey) in which he also traces "Studies in New Testament Hymns," pp. 2-21 (cf. also pp. 31f).
 5. Op.Cit., pp. 338f.
 6. Op.Cit., pp. 15-20; see also pp. 47-52.

3. Formulae often use terminology and exhibit a rhythmical style not characteristic of the surrounding context.

a. Their words can often be arranged in lines and strophes, perhaps characterized by such rhetorical devices as parallelismus membrorum, homoioteleuton, isosyllabism, anaphora and the like, tending to be concise, stately, solemn, and possibly 'liturgical'. The lines are often antithetical.

b. They favor appositions and noun predicates while avoiding superfluous words such as particles and conjunctions. There is a tendency for the forms to be expressed in language which is exalted and liturgical, especially when the content expresses praise to the divine or is caught up in theological concepts.

4. The scope of the formulae often extends beyond that necessitated by the context.

B. Formulae often express their thought by thesis rather than by argument, and usually refer to the elementary truths and events of salvation-history.

In the light of these tools of literary criticism, it needs to be considered whether or not there is sufficient evidence to regard I.3.16b as an inserted traditional pericope.

First, it appears to bear all the markings of being a 'contextual dislocation.' 1) The sentence: "καὶ ἐμολογούμενως μέγα ἐστὶν τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον," acts as an introductory phrase to I.3.16b; and it is interesting that

it contains the hapax legomenon ὁμολογουμένως. This particular term, according to D.G. Delling and V.H. Neufeld, may have been intentionally chosen by the author-redactor to hint that the following six lines come from an early confessional tradition.⁷ 2) I.3.16b is also introduced by the relative pronoun ὅς, a common indication of the presence of traditional material.⁸ In brief, this is a complex relative clause with a masculine relative pronoun which does not connect grammatically with what has gone before. As C.F.D. Moule describes it:⁹ "The very fact that it starts abruptly with a relative pronoun unattached (apparently) to any antecedent suggests a quotation from something that the readers already knew and would recognize." Also, J.H. Bernard notes that "the abruptness of ὅς at once disappears if the text is taken as an introduced quotation."¹⁰

-
7. Delling (Worship in the New Testament, trans. P. Scott, Philadelphia, 1962, p. 88) suggests that "the presence of the adverb certainly points to the verse as a statement of common faith." Neufeld (The Earliest Christian Confessions, Leiden, 1863, p. 129) also thinks that the adverb may point to the 'homologia', which "represented the agreement or consensus in which the Christian community was united, that core of essential conviction and belief to which Christians subscribed and openly testified" (p. 20). For a discussion of this introductory phrase and of the exact meaning of ὁμολογουμένως, infra, Excursus I, esp. p. 287, n. 12.
 8. So E. Norden, Op. Cit., pp. 168ff., 201-7, 383ff. E. Schweizer (Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern, Zürich, 1962, p. 104, n. 419) observes: "Mit ὅς beginnt das Zitat auch Phil. 2, 6; Kol. 1, 15, 18; mit dem sachlich gleichwertigen Partizip Röm. 1, 3; vgl. I. Pet. 3, 18b."
 9. The Birth of the New Testament (BNTC), London, 1966, p. 25.
 10. The Pastoral Epistles, Cambridge, 1899, p. 62.

Naturally, it is of benefit to be sure that ὁς has no antecedent in the context. In this regard, one is faced with the only variant reading in the text. Although the accepted reading ὁς is well-attested by the uncials Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus and Ephraemi Rescriptus, as well as by many Fathers, the Sahidic, Coptic and Ethiopic versions and all modern editors, ^{accept it} there is still strong evidence for two other variant readings. Later correctors of the above-mentioned uncials together with numerous later manuscripts give the rendering Θε (or Θεός) instead of οc (ὁς). R.F. Horton points out that οc, which is the contraction for Θεός, could have been easily confused with the relative pronoun οc. But the preponderance of evidence would support the view that Θε was a later corruption of the more difficult and ambiguous reading οc.¹¹ The other variant is the relative ὁ, rendered by the uncial Bezae Cantabrigiensis, the Latin Vulgate and some of the Latin Fathers. It is no doubt a corruption, made by a copyist who thought that the relative should agree with τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, which precedes it.¹² Hence, while these two well-attested variants remain, the evidence is not strong enough to compel changing

11. The Pastoral Epistles (CBS), Edinburgh, 1901, p. 112. Horton comments: "No change in the R.V. was thought to be more important than the substitution of 'he who' for 'God'. One might have supposed that the Divinity of our Lord depended on a faded line in a greek uncial."

12. Cf. R.P. Martin, Op. Cit., p. 31, n. 76; C.K. Barrett, The Pastoral Epistles (NCBS), Oxford, 1963, p. 65.

the more probable reading ος.¹³

There remains one further argument that ος has an antecedent in the context. If the introductory statement - καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶν τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον - is treated as parenthetical, then θεοῦ ζῶντος could possibly be the antecedent of ος. However, this is unlikely for the following reasons: a) Logically, the latter part of I.3.16 beginning with the relative ος appears to stand in apposition to τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, which would rule out consideration of the introductory statement as parenthetical. b) Structurally, the phrase θεοῦ ζῶντος maintains a secondary role in the preceding sentence, being a genitive of possession to one of three substantives standing in a predicate nominative position to the indefinite relative pronoun ἥτις, referring to the οἶκῳ θεοῦ.¹⁴ The case for θεοῦ ζῶντος would be stronger if, instead of translating the previous statement: "the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and foundation of truth...", it could be translated: "the house of God, which is the church of the living God, (who is) the pillar and foundation of truth,..." (the parenthetical introductory statement), who was manifested..." In this regard, it is interesting to note that the implied subject of ος is Jesus Christ, who in

13. That ος is the original reading is now generally accepted. See E. Norden, Op. Cit., pp. 254f, n. 2; E.K. Simpson, The Pastoral Epistles, London, 1954, p. 60. An interesting series of lectures was given by J. Berriman in 1736-7 and printed in 1741 (A Critical Dissertation upon I Timothy 3: 16, London) in which he examines the Greek and Latin Fathers and over 100 mss. and comes to the conclusion that θεός is the best reading.

14. Although ἥτις obviously carries the thought on from οἶκῳ θεοῦ, the gender is not masculine but feminine by attraction to the subsequent ἐκκλησία.

doctrine is believed to be one with the 'Living God'.

Moreover, it could be argued that the six lines speak of one who is divine, and therefore, even if the grammatical case is weak, the internal evidence for their connection is strong. For one would expect, even with an inserted tradition, that some train of thought would be carried through.¹⁵

Nevertheless, it is probable that the statement above is correct, that this is a complex relative clause with a masculine relative pronoun which does not connect grammatically with any word or phrase which precedes it. This certainly helps to set I.3.16b off from its context.

3) That I.3.16b is in fact a complex relative clause is another important observation, pointing to its stylistic variation from the context and further to its unique, poetic characteristics. Notice how this complex relative clause falls naturally into six parallel lines:

- | | | |
|-------|----------------|-------------|
| i - | (ὅς) ἐφανερώθη | ἐν σαρκί |
| ii - | ἐδικαιώθη | ἐν πνεύματι |
| iii - | ᾧ | ἄγγελοι |
| iv - | ἐκηρύχθη | ἐν ἔθνεσιν |
| v - | ἐπιστεύθη | ἐν κόσμῳ |
| vi - | ἀνελήμφθη | ἐν δόξῃ |

15. This is the argument of J.B. Rowell ("The Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ Vindicated", Bibliotheca Sacra, 114 (1, 57) pp. 70-77) and J.J. van Oosterzee (Die Pastoralbriefe und der Brief an Philemon, Bielefeld/Liepzig, 1874, pp. 48f.). Against this view stand H.J. Holtzmann (Die Pastoralbriefe: Kritisch und Exegetisch Behandelt, Leipzig, 1880, p. 328) and N. Brox (Die Pastoralbriefe [RNT, VII.2], Regensburg, 1969, p. 160), though no reasons are given. That there is a progression of thought in I Timothy which lends itself to the insertion of I.3.16b is suggested below, Excursus I, pp. 286ff.

Each line begins with a third singular aorist indicative verb, and would be spoken, therefore, "with identical accent and sound patterns".¹⁶ It is equally striking that each line ends with a dative noun, and five of these nouns are preceded by the preposition ἐν.¹⁷

Such unusual features are clearly to be set apart from their context; but there are more. It appears that the author of I.3.16b consciously employed rhetorical devices to give this verse a lyrical form. For there is a 'paromoiosis' (or 'parallelism of sound') present among the six lines. Indeed, if line iii were omitted, the other five lines could be read in Greek with great similarity. a) Although there is no 'isosyllabism' in the strict sense of the word, the first two

16. F.D. Gealy, The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and The Epistle to Titus (IB, XI), New York, 1955, p. 421.

17. E. Schweizer ("The New Testament Creeds Compared", Neotestamentica, Zürich/Stuttgart, 1963, p. 125) writes: "Only in the third line would the 'in' be impossible;... This 'in' is certainly to be interpreted in a strictly local sense in lines 4 and 5. The same is true for lines 1 and 2, since the parallels show that these terms circumscribe two spheres. It is probably the same also in lines 3 and 6..." N. Turner (J.H. Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, III, Edinburgh, 1963, p. 58) points out that the passive of ὁράω "may attach the person concerned by means of the dative, rather than ὑπό c. gen." In this case, ἐν is not used prior to the dative. But in Lk. 9.31 (οἱ ἀποθέντες ἐν δόξῃ), where there is no reference to persons, the passive form of ὁράω is followed by an ἐν preceding the dative. This suggests: a) that it would be unusual for ἐν to follow ῥῶθῃ here in I.3.16b, but not 'impossible'; b) that line iii should probably not be interpreted 'in a strictly local sense'. It may even be suggested that the third line included an ἐν prior to the pericope's use in I.3.16b which could have brought out the locative sense - 'appeared among angels'. But such a suggestion is speculative.

lines can be read poetically to sound the same length (eight syllables).¹⁸ Moreover, lines iv and v both have eight syllables and line vi has seven. Only line iii is out of character with its five syllables. b) The verse exhibits 'homoioteleuton' on two accounts, the -θη at the end of every verb, and the ι at the end of lines i and ii, σαρκί and πνεύματι. c) There are other less significant cases of assonance: the ώ before -θη in lines i and ii and the somewhat similar ῶφ-θη in iii; the accent in the verbs always occurring on the penult; the opening of lines i, ii, iv and v with ἐ-; the ύ- sound before -θη in lines iv and v; the accented ό in κόσμῳ and δόξῃ; and the striking repetition of ἐν in five of the six lines. As R.P. Martin writes:¹⁹

"All these features give a special character to the words, and imprint upon them what J. Schmitt calls 'un rythme hiératique'. There is a lyrical quality about the verse which defies translation. As B.S. Easton comments, 'the Greek assonances cannot be reproduced and the crisp allusiveness is lost on modern ears'."

An examination of the vocabulary also suggests the verse's 'contextual dislocation'. A similar contrast of σάρξ/πνεῦμα is found elsewhere in Romans 1.3-4 and I Peter 3.18ff., many recent scholars considering these to be inserted traditions.

The verbs φανερώω and ῥηθῇ are also found in other

18. Line ii actually has nine syllables. R.P. Martin (Op. Cit., p. 22) argues that lines i and ii both have nine syllables. If one counts the relative ὅς in line i, this is correct. But to include ὅς in the lyrical reading of the lines does not enhance the parallelism of sound otherwise heard. This is especially true when comparing lines i and ii where ἐφανερώθη and ἐδικαιώθη both have five syllables, three of which rhyme.

19. See J. Schmitt, Jésus ressuscité dans la prédication apostolique, Paris, 1949, p. 100; B.S. Easton, The Pastoral Epistles, London, 1948, p. 136. Cf. D.G. Delling, Op. Cit., p. 89.

confessions, the former in II Timothy 1.9-10 and the latter in I Cor. 15. 3ff (vv. 5-8). Otherwise, neither φανερώνω nor any form of ὀράω are found elsewhere in the Pastorals. The use of δικαίω in line ii appears to be different from that often found in the New Testament. Also, the passive form of πιστεύω in line v is unusual, according to R.P. Martin:²⁰

"The passive form is hapax legomenon in the New Testament (except in 2 Thessalonians i. 10) and a strange construction, as von Soden notes. He puts this down to poetic licence; but Norden prefers to regard it as a further liturgical and rhetorical trait."

On the whole, the words appear to have been chosen very carefully creating not only a concise, solemn, stately and possibly 'liturgical' style, but also a gradation of thought which forms a literary unit all of its own. It is a picture of Christ, extending from his appearance "in flesh" to his ultimate reception "in glory", drawn in a series of antitheses depicting the gradual awareness of his Lordship in both heaven and earth.²¹

20. Op. Cit. See H. von Soden, Die Pastoralbriefe, Freiburg I. B. und Leipzig, 1893, p. 233; E. Norden, Op. Cit., p. 255, n. 3. Martin also notes (p. 31, n. 80) that the passive ἐπιστεύθη is used in Diognetus 11.3 "in a passage which has many of the lyrical qualities of I Tim. iii.16": ἵνα κόσμῳ φανῇ· ὅς ὑπὸ λαοῦ ἀτιμασθεῖς, διὰ ἀποστόλων κηρύχθεῖς, ὑπὸ ἔθνων ἐπιστεύθη. Cf. F.D. Gealy (Op. Cit., p. 421) who argues that the vocabulary is not characteristic of the Pastorals.

However, a note of caution is required. To speak of the passive form ἐπιστεύθη as hapax legomenon in I.3.16b "except in 2 Thessalonians i.10" is self-contradictory (i.e. hapax means 'once'). Moreover, while πιστεύω occurs in its third singular aorist indicative passive form only in these two verses in the NT, it occurs elsewhere in the NT in other aorist passive forms: 3rd pl. ind. - Rom. 3.2; 1st sg. ind. - I Tim. 1.11, Tit. 1.3; inf. - I Thess. 2.4.

21. For a discussion of the antitheses of the pericope, Sec. B. 3, commencing p. 27; esp. pp. 56ff.

4) That the scope of I.3.16b extends beyond that necessitated by the context is not necessarily the case. For, as will be seen below,²² I.3.16b has both a confessional and a polemic purpose in the context; and this brief outline of the appearance and exaltation of Christ is both sufficient and necessary to support these purposes. However, the change of subject from bishops, deacons and the church to angels, nations and the world definitely helps to set it apart from the context.

Finally, the thought of I.3.16b proceeds by thesis rather than by argument, and is heard as confession rather than as persuasion. It relates not only to salvation-events in the past (as in I Cor. 15.3-5; etc.), but also to the occurrence of salvation in the present and future. All these evidences and more which will become obvious as the thesis proceeds, may be accepted to prove beyond doubt that we are examining here not only an inserted traditional pericope, but also a beautiful piece of tradition which was very carefully formed to express as meaningfully as possible the universal Lordship of Jesus Christ.²³

One further matter remains to be clarified before proceeding to the next major question of the formal analysis. This has to do with the delimitation of the original pericope.

22. Infra, Excursus I, pp. 286ff.

23. One further observation may be added in passing, which is, the writer's apparent fondness for quotation (So W. Lock, The Pastoral Epistles (ICC), Edinburgh, 1924, p. 44). For examples of other possibly inserted traditions in the Pastorals, cf. I Tim. 1.15; 2.4ff. 6.11ff.; II Tim. 1.9f.; 2.8,11ff.; 4.1; Tit. 1.1ff.; 2.11ff.; 3.4ff.

Does the presence of the relative ὅς, without any antecedent clause or word, mean that the quotation is only a fragment? Many scholars think so. Indeed, some have been anxious to suggest the content of the missing words which preceded it. D.M. Stanley, following the lead of W. Lock, attempts to identify the missing content with Eph. 5.14:²⁴

"Wake up, you sleeper,
and arise from death,
and Christ will light you up...(Eph. 5.14)
Who was revealed..."

More recently, J.T. Sanders has suggested that ὅς was "originally linked...to a preceding thanksgiving."²⁵ Less ambitious is R.F. Horton, who thinks it must have been preceded by words similar to "Let us praise Christ our Lord, who..."²⁶ Similarly J. Jeremias suggests that it was taken out of the context of a community hymn to Christ in which the note of praise might have been something like "Preis und Ehre sei IHM, der da geoffenbart wurde..."²⁷ However, if only a few introductory words

24. "Carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere....," CBQ, XX, Washington D.C., 1958, p. 184; cf. also C. Spicq, Saint Paul, les Épitres Pastorales, Paris, 1969, pp. 471ff.; W. Lock, Op. Cit., p. 45. R.P. Martin (Op. Cit., p. 25) writes: "The relative pronoun ὅς indicates that it belongs to a larger statement because, as it stands, the hymn lacks an explicit subject." R.St.John Parry (The Pastoral Epistles, Cambridge, 1920, p. 22) suggests that the antecedent could possibly be the ἑσπερινὸς ἕρκυς in I.1.15. E.F. Scott (The Pastoral Epistles (MNTC), London, 1936, p. 40) thinks that it is the closing part of a "lyrical confession"; while F.D. Gealy (Op. Cit., p. 421) considers it "a fragment broken from a longer hymn". These hypothetical suggestions are interesting, but appear to be founded more in wishful thinking than in logical deduction.

25. Op. Cit., p. 16.

26. Op. Cit., p. 112.

27. Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus (NTD, IX), Göttingen, 1953, p. 22.

are actually missing, it would be somewhat misleading to call the quotation a fragment. It would be nearer to the facts to say that it looks as if a fragment of the quotation is missing; and this is probably correct. For one must take into account R. Deichgräber's argument that I.3.16b is too well-rounded to be considered only a fragment.²⁸ As has been suggested above and will become evident below, the six lines form a literary unit all of their own, a complete though brief portrayal of the person and work of Christ, past, present and future. Hence, while E. Norden contends that it is impossible to determine whether the form is a complete hymn or merely a fragment,²⁹ one may at least hold that the evidence is strong for viewing the received quotation as a literary whole, and therefore probably not as a fragment.³⁰

2. Now that it has become increasingly clear that I.3.16b is an inserted traditional pericope, the question arises as to the original nature of this form. Was it 'eine Bekenntnisformel oder ein alter christlicher Gesang?' The inquiry into this question is more a matter of interest than of necessity, for modern studies have shown that hymns and confessions are not rigidly separated in the New Testament.³¹

28. Op. Cit., p. 134, n. 1.

29. Op. Cit., pp. 254ff.

30. R.H. Gundry ("The Form, Meaning and Background of the Hymn Quoted in I Timothy 3:16," Apostolic History and the Gospel, ed. W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin, Grand Rapids, 1970, p. 219, n. 4) notes: "It remains possible that 2s was a conventional way in which Christians opened their hymns to Christ."

31. See especially the unpublished thesis of I-Jin Loh, Op. Cit., pp. 31ff.; also R.P. Martin, Op. Cit., pp. 16ff. I-Jin Loh comments that the question of a clear-cut demarcation between confession and hymn in the NT is in

Since prayers and confessions as well as hymns "adhered to the rhythmical prose which was common throughout the religious worship of the ancient East" prior to the time of Augustine and were not therefore sharply differentiated in diction and style from each other,³² it is virtually impossible to determine by means of form whether I.3.16b was a hymn, a confession, or some other part of the liturgy. In terms of content,

Contd.] desperate need of answering. This is especially evident with reference to the numerous varying descriptions which have been given to I.3.16b: "a creedal hymn" (R. Falconer, The Pastoral Epistles, Oxford, 1937, p. 138); "a liturgical confession or hymn" (F.D. Gealy, Op. Cit., p. 421); "a primitive epitome of christological instruction" (E.K. Simpson, Op. Cit., p. 60); "a lyrical confession of Christ" (E.F. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 40); "a eucharistic hymn" (E.F. Brown, The Pastoral Epistles, London, 1917, p. 32); or "a primitive creed or summary of the chief acts to be believed about Jesus Christ" (N.J.D. White, The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus (EGT, IV), London, 1910, p. 118). That there were in existence such forms as 'hymns' in the early church is well-attested. (For books considering this fact, supra, p. 10, n. 1). But literary criticism has not yet been able to distinguish these hymns in the NT from other non-hymnic forms. Several suggestions have been made by scholars to help distinguish these forms and such as are helpful have been included in the discussion and footnotes which follow. But because of the lack of clarity the discussion of this question will be brief.

32. So, A.B. Macdonald, Christian Worship in the Primitive Church, Edinburgh, 1934, pp. 112-9; cf. also M. Patrick, The Story of the Church's Song, Edinburgh, 1929, p. 20. In this light, R. Deichgräber's conclusion reached in his discussion of "Verkündigungsformeln, Homologia und Bekenntnisformeln" hardly clarifies this relationship at all. He writes: "Die Christushymnen unterscheiden sich von den prägnant formulierenden Verkündigungsformeln und den knappen akklamatorischen Bekenntnissen deutlich durch ihre Plerophorie und ihre klar poetische Form" (Op. Cit., p. 117). As I-Jin Loh (Op. Cit., p. 35, n. 2) notes: "A close look at the passages generally classified as kerygma or homologia will show that poetic features are almost as marked as that of the hymnic ones." Note also the view of F.V. Filson ("How much of the New Testament is Poetry?" JBL, Vol. 67 (1948) p. 113), who thinks that the epistles of the NT in general, including I.3.16b, "offer little ground for speaking of poetry, although at times they rise to noteworthy elevation of prose style."

G. Schille [at the end of a section in his thesis entitled "Merkmale hymnischer Zitate"] concludes:³³

"Alle diese Züge erklären sich von daher, daß der Hymnus für die älteste Zeit Bekenntnis ist. 'Bekennen' meint zunächst den Lobpreis Gottes als öffentliches Eintreten für den Gepriesenen...(continues)"

This was also, generally, the argument of J. Kroll, who could not justify the eagerness of some scholars (like A. Seeberg³⁴) to classify I.3.16b exclusively as a hymn:³⁵

33. Op. Cit., p. 20 (cf. 18-20).

34. A. Seeberg (Op. Cit., p. 124, n. 1) disqualifies the idea of I.3.16b being a confession. For him, it is natural in a confession to speak only of what one holds to be the truths of salvation, but not of how the heathen and the world relate to it. But it is doubtful if he has sufficient grounds for limiting the confession in this way.

35. Die christliche Hymnodik bis zu Klemens von Alexandria, Königsberg, 1921 (reprinted, Darmstadt, 1968), p. 16, n. 2. For the reference to Norden, supra, pp. 10f., n. 3. More recently, I-Jin Loh has suggested that there was some 'line of evolution' which may be possibly ascertained between the concise confessional forms and the expanded hymnic forms. First, he refers to R. Bultmann's suggestion ("Bekenntnis und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief," Coniectanea Neotestamentica in honorem A. Fridrichsen, XI (1947) pp. 1-14) that hymns are to be distinguished from early confessions and homologia which are shorter and more concise in form. Then he proceeds further to try to clarify this idea (Op. Cit., p. 36): "It is well-known that the basic Pauline homologia is the acclamation of the Lordship of Christ. It is also recognized that the core of the primitive kerygma consists of the proclamation of the dual saving events of the death and resurrection of Jesus. It is striking that the basic content of the homologia and the kerygma recur either explicitly or implicitly in many of the hymnic fragments recovered in the New Testament...it is likely that these hymns represent the expanded and developed forms of the early church acclamations and proclamations." (See his thesis for references to support his statements.)

It is also interesting to note that while Kroll considers it probable that the original intention of the author was not to create a hymn but to create a confession or catechism, and while I-Jin Loh writes of a line of evolution from the confession to the hymnic forms, A.B. Macdonald (Op. Cit., pp. 118ff.) would turn its origin around. Macdonald views the early Church as one filled with the Spirit with its enthusiasm showing through spontaneous, improvised songs.

[Contd.]

"Man pflegt I Tim. 3,16 gern als ein Lied auf Christus anzusprechen...Es ist mir aber doch fraglich, ob man die Stelle als einen Hymnus in engeren Sinne auffassen kann. Norden hat sie mit Recht zu den Symbola gestellt...(he had called it a 'liturgische Bekenntnisformel'), zu deren Urformen sie gehören mag...Eine bekenntnismäßige Formel kann nun sehr wohl ihren Platz im Hymnus haben. Wir wissen das z.B. aus den feierlichen eucharistischen Gebeten mit ihrer Aufzählung der Heilstatsachen; sie sind in der Hauptsache jüdisch-hellenistisches Erbe. Eine ausführliche Preis- und Danksagung muß von selbst in eine solche Aufzählung münden...So kann der Hymnus direkt lehrhaften Charakter bekommen. Man muß aber betonen, daß eine solche prägnante Zusammenstellung sehr wohl auch außerhalb jeder hymnodischen Absicht entstanden sein kann, als Bekenntnis, Lehrformel u.ä. Und um derartiges kann es sich im vorliegenden Falle handeln. Mir ist das wahrscheinlicher. Entscheiden läßt es sich natürlich nicht. Freilich die Form ist in beiden Fällen die nämliche: die gehobene Diktion religiöser Rede..."

In this respect, what was true fifty years ago in Kroll's day is also true today. Many a scholar 'pflegt I.3.16b gern als ein Lied auf Christus anzusprechen.' This is especially true of R. Deichgräber, who takes issue with J. Kroll and argues that this verse is clearly a hymn. He would even avoid calling it a 'Bekenntnislied.' For Deichgräber, the following considerations prove his point: first, he argues with J. Marty³⁶ that a confession would not, in such a free manner, break the actual course of events by placing before Christ's

Contd.] Although most of these improvisations of the moment were quickly forgotten, occasionally one which was worthy of a longer life would fix itself in the memory of someone, who in turn would re-utter it in some richer, more artistic form. Hence, from a history within the worship of the community, either as a hymn or thanksgiving prayer or the like, creedal confessions eventually developed. See also E.F. Scott, The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians (MNTC), London, 1930, pp. 231f.

36. Jacques Marty, "Étude des textes cultuels de prière contenus dans le Nouveau Testament", Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, 4/5 (1929) p. 369.

ascension two lines concerning his mission. Secondly, Deichgräber maintains that I.3.16b follows the same pattern of "Präexistenz, Erniedrigung und Erhöhung" as Phil. 2.6-11, which is an early Christian hymn.³⁷ But neither of these arguments is sufficient to prove that the verse is exclusively a hymn. The first argument is a judgment concerning confessions which is not binding as a literary guideline. It is only one man's opinion. The second argument, which for Deichgräber is more important, is also ~~inconclusive~~ inconclusive. For many scholars still question whether I.3.16b does in fact follow the same pattern as Phil. 2.6-11;³⁸ and even if it did, this would not prove that I.3.16b was exclusively a hymn, or for that matter, a hymn at all.

On the other hand, one tends to justify the designation of 'hymn' for I.3.16b for the following reasons: a) the finer qualities of its form including the assonance which lends itself to melodic expression; b) that 'ardor of enthusiasm' which J. Kroll says is characteristic of early Christian hymns;³⁹ and c) the six 'Tatprädikationen' which lend them-

37. Op. Cit., pp. 133ff., esp. p. 133, n. 3.

38. In Phil. 2.6ff., it is very possible that J. Jeremias ("Zur Gedankenführung in den paulinischen Briefen," Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwann, edd. J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik, Haarlem, 1953, pp. 150-4) is correct to view it as patterned according to the pre-existence, earthly existence and post-earthly existence of the redeemer. But in Jeremias' arrangement, more than half of Phil. 2.6ff. is included under the first two headings. In contrast to this, only line 1 of I.3.16b relates to Jesus' earthly life, and some scholars would question whether pre-existence is implied in the form at all.

39. Op. Cit., p. 11. The translation of the phrase is borrowed from J.T. Sanders, Op. Cit., p. 2.

selves to praise and thanksgiving.⁴⁰ However, this designation must always be thought of in the broad sense of the term, i.e. thought of in general terms as a 'Bekenntnislied,' since it is so clearly marked by its enumeration of various facts of salvation.⁴¹ Thus, the statement of G. Holtz is probably closer to the original nature of the form: "Der Hymnus wurde im Gottesdienst als Bekenntnislied gesungen."⁴²

3. The traditional character of I.3.16b is now obvious, and it may be referred to in general as a 'Bekenntnislied.' But this recognition brings with it a multitude of intricate problems, as R.H. Gundry observes:⁴³

"The hymnic quotation is notorious for the different schematizations and consequently varying interpretations laid upon it by modern commentators."

Therefore, the third question of the formal analysis must relate to the structure of I.3.16b with a view to clarifying the interpretation of the verse.

The method will be to examine the historical treatment of this verse, with the aim that by a critical analysis of

-
40. The element of 'praise' is seen by many to be a characteristic of early Christian hymnody. Along this line of thought is also the idea of R.P. Martin (Op. Cit., p. 26; idem., Carmen Christi, London, 1967, pp. 20f.) that NT hymns often have certain Christological themes in common: the pre-existence of Christ and his pre-temporal activity, Christ's role as cosmological Lord who receives the homage of all orders of creation (heaven and earth), the cosmic context in which Christ's redemption is achieved, etc. This is characteristic of I.3.16.
41. It is difficult to conclude with J.N.D. Kelly (The Pastoral Epistles, London, 1963, p. 89) that these formal considerations definitely show that I.3.16b is a hymn and not a creedal or catechetical piece of tradition. See above, pp. 23ff. and the statements of G. Schille and J. Kroll.
42. Die Pastoralbriefe, Berlin, 1965, p. 90.
43. Op. Cit., p. 203.

former views, the probable structure of the form may be ascertained. But it is remarkable how many arrangements of these six lines are possible. They may be arranged in 1) three stanzas of two lines each, 2) two stanzas of three lines each, or possibly in 3) six parallel lines, a) seeing in them a résumé of the chief events of our Lord's 'earthly' ministry up to the ascension, or b) with a wider perspective of viewing them chronologically from the incarnation to the final victory to come. Moreover, each of these arrangements may be slightly altered or expanded, thus presenting numerous possibilities as far as structure is concerned.

The problem of the correct arrangement of the lines may at first seem unimportant. But it takes on new significance when it is realized how much the arrangement is bound up with the interpretation of the form. For, if there is parallelism, if there is antithesis, if there is a chronological order, etc., such formal aspects of the structure will help to govern the interpretation of the form. Unfortunately, in past research of I.3.16b the reverse has often been true - the scholar's attitude to the contents of the form has frequently governed his formal analysis. Obviously, it is important not to fall victim to this erroneous method. Care must be taken not to impose any presupposed patterns upon I.3.16b lest the objectivity of its analysis of structure be lost, thereby rendering it useless for interpretation. It is with this in mind that the problem of structure is to be approached historically.

Attention will be focused primarily on those who have made significant contributions to the understanding of I.3.16b.

The purpose is not to provide an exhaustive list of all the scholars who have ever written on this text and their viewpoints, but to canvass what has been written in an attempt to arrive at the probable structure of the form. This historical survey may also serve the purpose of introducing the difficult problems of interpretation and background of I.3.16b, which will be dealt with in later chapters.⁴⁴

a - 19th century investigation of I.3.16b:

It is sufficient to begin with A.L.C. Heydenreich, one of the real pioneers of modern critical study of I.3.16b.⁴⁵ His discussion of the verse covers approximately 20 pages and treats many of the questions being discussed today. Concerning the structure of I.3.16b, he finds a "Parallelismus, der immer zwischen je zwei und zwei Gliedern statt findet,"⁴⁶ and the parallel lines include the following antitheses:⁴⁷

human	/	divine
apostles	/	Jews and Gentiles
world	/	glory of God

He also finds a certain chronological order in that lines iii - vi describe what happened after Christ's resurrection (implied in line ii), and lines i and vi describe respectively God's manifestation as a man and Christ's final glory which in the end places Him in the situation where He was before the world began.⁴⁸ But he sees a difficulty in the time order with

44. Special attention should be given to the problematic interpretation of lines ii and iii, the views concerning the background of I.3.16b and contributions as to the order of the lines.

45. Die Pastoralbriefe Pauli, Hadamar, 1826.

46. Ibid., p. 207.

47. Ibid., pp. 212-219.

48. Ibid., pp. 213, 219f.

line vi coming after lines iv and v; for in Acts the 'Himmelfahrt' comes chronologically before the 'proclamation to the nations' (iv) and its consequent 'believing acceptance in the world' (v). Heydenreich's answer is that line vi should be translated: "'er ist aufgenommen zur (in die) Herrlichkeit,' so ist ohnehin nicht bloss an die Aufnahme in den Himmel bei der Himmelfahrt, sondern an den Zustand der himmlischen Herrlichkeit überhaupt zu denken..."⁴⁹ Hence, he finds the following order:⁵⁰

- i - God was manifest as a man;
- ii - The power of God within Him (the Spirit) worked the wonder of his resurrection from the dead;
- iii - The apostles witnessed it;
- iv - He was preached (by the Apostles) as 'Gottessohn' to all the nations;
- v - This was followed by his recognition through belief by all;
- vi - Hence his final glory as the 'Sohn Gottes'.

Heydenreich concludes by rejecting the following arrangements as too unnatural:⁵¹

49. Ibid., p. 219.

50. Ibid., pp. 219f.

51. Ibid., p. 220. More recently, C.K. Barrett (The Pastoral Epistles, NCB, Oxford, 1963, pp. 65-6) also referred to the first of these two renderings:

"He who was manifested
was justified in the body,
appeared in the spirit to angels."

The latter rendering would be translated as follows:

"He who was manifested,
was justified in the flesh,
appeared in the spirit,
was proclaimed by angels (or messengers),
was believed among the nations,
in the world was accepted in glory."

θεὸς (ὁς) ἐφανερώθη
ἐν σαρκὶ ἐδικαιώθη
ἐν πνεύματι ὡφθῇ ἀγγέλοις

(or) ὁς ἐφανερώθη
ἐν σαρκὶ ἐδικαιώθη
ἐν πνεύματι ὡφθῇ
ἀγγέλοις ἐκηρύχθη
ἐν ἔθνεσιν ἐπιστεύθη
ἐν κόσμῳ ἀνελημφθῇ ἐν
δόξῃ.

On review of Heydenreich's discussion, it can be seen that many of the questions he raised with reference to structure were to be among the main points of discussion throughout the 19th century: whether there is an antithetical parallelism inherent in the form; whether his interpretation of the antitheses (especially lines ii and iii as 'Christ's divine nature' and 'the apostles' respectively) is correct; and whether one can say that the form follows a chronological scheme, especially in lines iv - vi?

F.C. Baur, who regards the Pastoral Epistles as having been written in the middle of the second century as a defense against gnostic influence in the Church, interprets I.3.16b in this light as well.⁵² He supposes that the author of I.3.16b was trying to document not only the historical picture of Christ (ἐν σαρκί), but also his life in the 'Geisterwelt' (ἐν πνεύματι). Thus he finds a three-fold antithetical parallelism "in welchem das eine Glied mehr gnostisch, das andere mehr antignostisch lautet."⁵³ For whereas the orthodox picture of Christ was ἐν σαρκί,

52. Die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus, Stuttgart/Tübingen, 1835, pp. 28-33.

53. Ibid., p. 32.

Marcion's picture of Christ was ἐν πνεύματι. He continues:⁵⁴

"Dem auf die Geisterwelt sich beziehenden ὑποθῆναι ἄγγέλους entspricht das in der sinnlichen Welt geschehene κνευχῶναι ἐν ἅνεσιν, und völlig analog ist auch das Verhältniß der beiden folgenden Sätze ἐπιτερεύειν ἐν κόσμῳ und ἀναλημφέν ἐν δόξῃ, so daß durch jeden dieser Sätze soviel möglich auf gleiche Weise dem orthodoxen und dem gnostischen Interesse genügt werden soll, indem Christus eben so sehr nach seinem Verhältniß zur idealen geistigen Welt, die die Gnostiker vorzugsweise ins Auge faßten, als nach seinem Verhältniß zur realen Wirklichkeit, deren historischen Boden die Orthodoxen im Gegensatz gegen die Gnostiker festhalten mußten, betrachtet wird."

That lines ii, iii and vi present a gnostic picture of Christ is demonstrated by Baur in the following manner:⁵⁵

"Bei dem erstern dieser...Sätze ist ohne Zweifel der Moment der Taufe auf eine ähnliche Weise fixirt, wie ihn die Gnostiker als die Epiphanie des erlösenden Geistes besonders hervorhoben; der zweite Satz nimmt vielleicht das ὑποθῆναι ἄγγέλους ebenso, wie die Gnostiker Christus durch die Reiche der Engel hindurchgehen ließen, um zum Pleroma, zu dem ἀναλημφέναι ἐν δόξῃ zu gelangen."

This is a very interesting picture of the structure and consequent interpretation of I.3.16b, but unfortunately Baur's method is made suspect by the following considerations. First, the purpose of his entire work on the Pastoral Epistles is to show that the background of the author was mid-second century gnosticism, and that the letters are to be interpreted in that light. Secondly, Baur's discussion of I.3.16b comes in a section entitled "Gnostisch lautende Doxologien, Formeln und Ausdrücke," in which all of the "παράθηται" of the Pastorals are grouped together and treated. Thirdly, the

54. Ibid., p. 33. [The apparent errors of spelling are again due to early 19th century usage.]

55. Ibid., p. 32.

order of his presentation of I.3.16b is not exactly as it has been presented. His statement of the gnostic redeemer myth being found in lines ii, iii and vi comes prior to his acknowledgement of a three-fold antithetical parallelism, thereby suggesting (together with the above considerations) that Baur approached the hymn with the scheme of the gnostic redeemer myth in mind. Thus it seems likely that Baur's attitude to the contents of I.3.16b governed his formal-analysis, and this must be kept in mind when considering his point of view.⁵⁶

Baur is followed by M.J. Mack, who contributes to the understanding of the order of the lines. Whereas line i describes Christ's coming to earth ἐν σαρκί, lines ii - vi describe his elevation "bis zur Rückkehr in die Herrlichkeit."⁵⁷ However, this order is not altogether chronological. Lines ii and iii relate to his ascension from earth and his elevation and dominion over the angels; but this does not yet describe the entire elevation of the Lord. At the same time in the world his name is being proclaimed and believed. Only after all this is accomplished can it be said that Christ sits as the Triumphant One ἐν δόξῃ at the right hand of God. In this way it is seen how line vi has its basis in lines ii - iii and iv - v, and could only come after these facts were given.⁵⁸

56. Baur anticipates, apparently, R. Bultmann's similar interpretation of I.3.16b (*infra*, Chap. III, Sec. B.2); he may also be the source of Bultmann's interpretation.

57. Commentar über die Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus, Tübingen, 1836, pp. 292-3.

58. Ibid.

Although Mack groups lines ii - vi together according to their content without finding any grammatical support, W.M.L. de Wette finds grammatical support for this division in the relation of the six parallel lines to the relative ὅς. For de Wette, line i is the subject of the form which the relative ὅς introduces, and lines ii - vi consist of the predicate. Hence, the form would be translated:⁵⁹

"Who was manifested in the flesh,
(the same) was justified in the spirit,
appeared to angels...etc."

Later commentators refer to this subject/predicate relationship as the 'Vorder- und Nachsätze.'

De Wette also agrees with his predecessors that the form is characterized by antithetical parallelism, and with Baur would find a contrast between the "Irdischen" and "Übersinnlichen" spheres of life, adding the observation that the contrast which occurs three times in succession "ist jedes Mal umgekehrt."⁶⁰ However, in contrast to Baur who finds in lines ii, iii and vi a reference to "die gnostische Rückkehr Christi ins Pleroma," de Wette thinks that this "übersinnliche Scene" refers to the "himmlischen Widerspiel der Höllenfahrt" of I Pet. 3.18ff.⁶¹

59. Kurze Erklärung der Briefe an Titus, Timotheus und die Hebräer, Leipzig, 1844, p. 87. Mack projected this possibility (Op. Cit., p. 294), but rejected it as being another internal proof that θεός, and not ὅς, was the original reading of the text. Cf. also Heydenreich, Op. Cit., p. 210.

60. Ibid., p. 88.

61. Ibid.

One further point of interest is added by A. Bisping, who in general repeats the position of de Wette. A. Bisping would emphasize that in lines iii and iv where the contrast is "umgekehrt," ἄγγελος does not refer to the 'apostles' but to "the highest creatures, the angels," in contrast to "the lowest creatures, the heathen."⁶²

It may be noted that in the first two-thirds of the 19th century, from Heydenreich (1826) to Bisping (1965), German scholars were in basic agreement as to the structure of I.3.16b. The six lines were divided into three sets of pairs (3x2), each pair embodying a contrast between the datival nouns involved. This viewpoint was refined to the point where de Wette wrote of a general contrast throughout the hymn of the 'Irdischen' with the 'Übersinnlichen' Spheres of Christ's life, noting that the middle contrasting pair is 'umgekehrt.' They also agreed that the order of the lines was to some extent chronological, though they recognized the difficulty of line vi coming after lines iv and v in this regard. Of importance here is the discussion by Mack in which he argues for the logical necessity of the order of lines ii - vi.⁶³ Also important to remember is de Wette's division of the form into a subject (line i) and a predicate (lines ii - vi).⁶⁴

62. Erklärung der drei Pastoralbriefe und des Briefes an Philemon, Münster, 1865, p. 186.

63. Supra, p. 33.

64. Supra, p. 34.

At this point in time, two other views were advocated concerning the structure of the form. The first is that of J.E. Huther, who instead of finding three sets of parallel lines (3x2), finds two sets of parallel lines each with a third line attached (2x3):

<u>earth</u>	<u>heaven</u>
i - manifested in the flesh	
ii - justified in the spirit	iii - appeared to angels
iv - preached in the nations	
v - believed in the world	vi - taken up in glory

He writes:⁶⁵

"Richtiger ist es deshalb, das Ganze in zwei Haupttheile zu trennen, deren jeder drei Glieder hat, von denen je die beiden ersten das was sich auf der Erde, der dritte was sich im Himmel zugetragen, hervorheben."

He argues first of all that de Wette's division of the form into a subject and predicate is wrong. He thinks it is more natural to view all six lines as coordinate relative sentences.⁶⁶ Secondly, the contrast between ἐν σαρρί and ἐν πνεύματι in lines i and ii is not a contrast between the human and the divine (or higher Spirit) of Christ, but between the outer and the inner man of Christ. Ἐν πνεύματι refers to the Idealistic concept of the inner man, that spirit of man which is the principle of life.⁶⁷ Hence, lines i and ii do not contrast the 'Irdischen' and the 'Übersinnlichen'

65. Kritisch Exegetisches Handbuch über die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus, Göttingen, 1866, p. 164. Cf. R.F. Horton, (Op. Cit., p. 112), whose view is similar to Huther's.

66. Ibid., pp. 160f.

67. For a clear summary of this view of the 'spirit of man' in the latter 19th century, cf. R. Jewett, Paul's Anthropological Terms, Leiden, 1971, pp. 167f.

spheres of existence, but relate to Christ's life here on earth. Similarly, he argues, lines iv and v form an obvious parallelism with each other, both on an earthly plane of existence. In contrast to lines i and ii, iv and v, lines iii and vi relate to Christ's experience in heaven, first his ascension and then his permanent dominion.⁶⁸

The other view which takes exception to the three-fold antithetical parallelism of the early 19th century is that of H. Alford. He views the form as simply six parallel lines describing in chronological order the chief events of our Lord's 'earthly' ministry up to the ascension.⁶⁹ For Alford, the fact that lines i and vi refer respectively to Jesus' birth and ascension is clear. Between these two events comes the following sequence of events: line ii - Jesus' baptism when the Holy Spirit came down upon him, and his temptation experience when the Spirit led and empowered him; line iii - the ministry of the angels to Jesus following his temptation experience; line iv - the apostolic preaching which began "during Jesus' ministry", obviously to the Jews and Samaritans, but this being the beginning of the proclamation to all nations; and line v - the faith of his first disciples, again being the initiatory response to that belief which will eventually take place throughout the whole world.⁷⁰

68. Huther, Op. Cit., pp. 162, 4.

69. For Alford (The Greek Testament, III, London, 1856; reprinted in Chicago, 1968), the six lines do not constitute an inserted pericope, but "present the free expansion of the mind of the writer [of I Tim.] in the treatment of his subject" (p. 334). Nevertheless, Alford does set the six lines apart as a literary unit, so one can speak of a 'form' in relation to Alford's interpretation as well.

70. Ibid., pp. 334f. This view anticipates that of W. Hendriksen, A Commentary on I and II Timothy and Titus, London, 1964, pp. 137-141.

This view has obvious problems which are at present important to consider, since so few scholars hold to this position or have commented upon it. The most difficult problem with this view is that it reads into the words a meaning they will not bear. Line iv surely cannot be limited to the pre-ascension preaching of the disciples since the preaching took place in Palestine before the Jews and not ἐν ἑθνεσιν, and since it most naturally refers to the wide proclamation that has taken place since the ascension. Similarly, line v must surely not be limited to the belief of the disciples prior to the ascension when it speaks of ἐν κόσμῳ. It is also questionable whether line i should be limited only to his birth and not to his whole manifestation in the flesh. According to Alford line iii refers to the ministry of the angels to Jesus; however in this case the angels appeared to Jesus whereas line iii speaks of Jesus presenting himself to them.⁷¹ Again, line vi may not refer to the ascension of Jesus into (εἰς) glory so much as his triumph in (ἐν) glory. Thus there are numerous problems with respect to the precise events which Alford relates to the six lines. Moreover, if the six lines are supposed to include the chief events of Christ's life, why are the two most important events - his death and resurrection - not even mentioned?⁷² For

71. *Infra*, Chap. II, p. 145.

72. R.H. Gundry (*Op. Cit.*, p. 204) further remarks: "Jesus' baptism and temptation and especially the angelic ministry to Jesus after his temptation appear to be unlikely points of emphasis for a hymnic précis of Jesus' ministry." The problems of relating the six lines to specific events in the life of Jesus will be thoroughly examined below in Chap. II.

these reasons, Alford's particular view of the structure of I.3.16b has not received much support from later scholars. One senses that chronology, to some extent, plays a role in the order of the lines. But it is doubtful that the lines refer to the exact sequence of events as Alford suggests.

During the last third of the 19th century, from the work of Bisping (1865), Huther (1866) and Alford (1865 - in England) to that of E. Riggenbach in 1895, commentators added very little to the discussion which had already taken place on the structure of the form. Nevertheless, there were several important changes. While J.C.K. von Hofmann reiterates the view of de Wette that line i is the subject or 'Vordersatz' of the form and the remaining lines the predicate or 'Nachsatz',⁷³ J.T. Beck suggests that the 'Nachsatz' begins with line v which in contrast to the first four lines tells of Christ's final reception and glory.⁷⁴ Commenting on these views, K. Knoke then asks why lines i, iii and v could not be regarded as "Vordersätze" and lines ii, iv and vi as "Nachsätze," thereby fitting in more naturally with the 'parallelismus membrorum' of the text. But he dismisses all these as having no basis in the text and as being dependent upon arbitrary selection. He thinks the syntax of the quoted lines suggests that all six lines stand in the same relation to ὅς thus forming one compound relative sentence without a quoted antecedent.⁷⁵

73. Die Briefe Pauli an Titus und Timotheus, Nördlingen, 1874, pp. 131f.

74. Erklärung der zwei Briefe Pauli an Timotheus, Gütersloh, 1879, pp. 159f.

75. Praktisch-theologischer Kommentar zu den Pastoralbriefen des Apostels Paulus, Göttingen, 1889, pp. 95f.

Nevertheless, H. von Soden, who follows Huther's basic 2x3 structure, understands the first three lines as the 'Vordersatz' and the last three lines as the 'Nachsatz'. The 'Vordersatz' depicts the developing stages in Jesus' personal life, and the 'Nachsatz' the stages of his success through the Church on earth.⁷⁶ In criticism of this view, R.H. Gundry writes:⁷⁷

"To maintain an earthly locale for line 6, von Soden interprets the taking up of Christ to mean a taking up by men, presumably through the appropriation of faith. But that idea has already been stated in line 5. Δόξη appears to contrast with κόσμος. Ἀνελήμφθη is technical for the ascension. And in the parallels adduced by von Soden, ἀναλαμβάνω has the sense of metaphorical appropriation only with impersonal objects (Acts 7:43; Eph. 6:13,16) and carries a purely physical sense (inappropriate to von Soden's view of line 6) when a personal object is in view (Acts 20:13f.; 23:31)."

This is a valid criticism of von Soden. However, it cannot be used against Huther's understanding of the structure since Huther viewed both lines iii and vi as taking place in heaven. Furthermore, he had argued that it is more natural to view all six lines as coordinate relative sentences rather than as divided between 'Vorder- und Nachsätze'.⁷⁸

Among those who viewed the structure in terms of a 3x2 arrangement during this part of the 19th century, J.T. Beck regards the antitheses as contrasting the 'Tiefe' and the 'Höhe', with the second couplet 'umgekehrt'.⁷⁹ E. Riggenbach

76. Op. Cit., pp. 237f. A. Seeberg continues this line of approach (infra, pp. 44f.).

77. Op. Cit., p. 205.

78. Supra, p. 36.

79. Op. Cit., pp. 159f.

views the contrast as being between the sphere of 'Fleish' and the 'Pneuma-sphäre', with the explanation:⁸⁰

"Wie das Fleish das Element war, in welchem die Offenb. [-barung], so war der Geist das Element, in welchem die Rechtfertigung erfolgte."

He also writes of the "chiastischer Stellung der Paare".⁸¹

This literary term which is now familiar and which refers in I.3.16b to the 'umgekehrt' arrangement of the couplets,

'appears' to have been first used by D.R. Kübel in 1888.⁸²

Finally, instead of emphasizing the antithetical nature of the couplets, J. Weiss notes the similarity of their ideas. For Weiss, lines i and ii denote the 'fact' of Christ's resurrection and exaltation, lines iii and iv the 'proclamation' of that fact, and lines v and vi the 'glory' which describes his reception.⁸³

b - 20th century investigation of I.3.16b:

In the preceding investigation, the attempt was made to clarify the contribution of the 19th century to the understanding of the structure of I.3.16b. The 19th century work was brought into consideration not only because scholars of that period were the real pioneers of this study, but also because there is a certain 'innocence' which to some extent pervades their formal analysis; that is, they were not so encumbered in their formal analysis by 'historical considerations'. By this phrase, reference is made to that aspect

80. Pastoralbriefe, München, 1895, p. 32.

81. Ibid.

82. Die Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus und der Hebräerbrief, Nördlingen, 1888, p. 112.

83. Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus, Göttingen, 1894, p. 169. Note R.H. Gundry's similar view, which is given below, pp. 56f.

of formal analysis which considers what possible influence contemporary patterns of thought may have had on the formation of the structure of I.3.16b. This is not to say that historical considerations did not influence either formal or linguistical analyses of I.3.16b in the 19th century, as H.J. Holtzmann demonstrates by summarizing the views of various scholars on line iii:⁸⁴

"Baur...versteht das Glied gnostisch vom Durchgehen Christi durch die Reihen der Aeonen, de Wette von einem himmlischen Widerspiel der Höllenfahrt, Schenkel nach Marc. 16,5. Matth. 28, 2. Luc. 24,4. Joh. 20,12 von der Auferstehung..., Huther, Immer, Weiss von der Himmelfahrt;..." (Holtzmann himself goes on to suggest that line iii is patterned after the Höllenfahrt [the 'descensus ad inferos'] of I Peter 3.19.)⁸⁵

It is only intended to point out that scholars in the 19th century were not as aware of the implications of similar contemporary patterns of thought on the structure of I.3.16b, and therefore that these patterns did not play much of a role in their consideration of the form.

In contrast to this 'innocence', the 20th century has so emphasized the methods of Formgeschichte, Religionsgeschichte, Traditionsgeschichte and Redaktionsgeschichte that scholars have had to be careful not to let their 'geschichtlicher Gesichtspunkt' play too large a role in determining the structure of the form. This problem will present itself below when the viewpoints of certain scholars on I.3.16b are considered. Such problems will not be dealt with at length

84. Op. Cit., pp. 332f.

85. Ibid., p. 333. This anticipates the view of R.H. Gundry, Op. Cit., pp. 213, 218f.

in this chapter, since Chap. III - An Analysis of History - will attempt to answer these questions. But it is important to keep the priority of the method of determining the right structure of I.3.16b in mind, which is: "not to impose any presupposed patterns upon I.3.16b lest the objectivity of its analysis of structure be lost, thereby rendering it useless for interpretation" (p. 28 above). It is hoped that the prior consideration of 19th century work may help in this task. However, if it can be observed that other contemporary patterns are similar to I.3.16b and possibly related in some way, the structure of those patterns may serve as a reason for accepting one certain structure of I.3.16b over another. But it was not until Martin Dibelius' commentary on the Pastoral Epistles in 1913 that these historical considerations began to be emphasized.

i - From J.P. Lilley (1901) to E. Norden (1912):

In 1901 J.P. Lilley supported Huther's and von Soden's 2x3 arrangement, viewing it in the following manner:⁸⁶

under humiliation fall:

- i - Christ's manifestation in the flesh
- ii - Christ's justification in the Spirit
- iii - Christ's appearance to angels

under exaltation fall:

- iv - Christ's being made the subject of preaching among nations
- v - Christ's being made the object of faith in the world
- vi - Christ's ascension to God's right hand.

He found that these lines were not in exact chronological sequence, but were selected as being representative features of each condition, humiliation and exaltation. But this

86. The Pastoral Epistles, Edinburgh, 1901, p. 112.

explanation is questionable since lines ii and iii do not appear to be 'representative' of humiliation. Lilley also finds parallelism between lines i and vi, ii and v, iii and iv, respectively:⁸⁷ "the Ascension presenting the Incarnation in its ideal...the justification of Christ being the ground of the faith men put in Him...the appearance to angels in the valley of humiliation being balanced by the proclamation of His name to the nations as their anointed King". However, it is felt that one could carry the question of parallelism to an extreme, as the following comparison of lines ii - vi with line i indicates:

manifested in the flesh - justified in the spirit
 manifested in the flesh - appeared to angels
 manifested in the flesh - preached among the nations
 manifested in the flesh - believed on in the world
 manifested in the flesh - taken up in glory

Each combination could be said to be parallel; and there are many other possible parallels remaining among the other five lines. For parallelism to be a factor in the structure of I.3.16b, it must exhibit some kind of consistency throughout the six lines. For de Wette, this consistency was found in the antithetical arrangement of the two spheres of life - in earth and in heaven - with the middle couplet 'umgekehrt'.⁸⁸ But there is no basis for Lilley's parallelism, since it is probable that lines ii and iii do not fall under the condition of 'humiliation' as he suggests.

Although A. Seeberg (1903) does not appear to offer any new contribution to the discussion of the structure of I.3.16b,

87. Ibid.

88. Supra, p. 34.

he very persuasively argues for the acceptance of H. von Soden's 2x3 arrangement and interpretation of the form. His only disagreement with von Soden appears in line iii, which he interprets as Christ's appearance to the Apostles after the resurrection. Hence, the first three lines together express the content of the 'mystery' of Christ while he was on earth. The last three lines, in contrast, "sollen zur Bestätigung dessen dienen, daß dem Mystorium das Prädikat der Größe zukommt".⁸⁹ Seeberg emphasizes that the first three lines are the 'Vordersatz' and the last three lines the 'Nachsatz', and that this 2x3 structure is further confirmed by the obvious parallelism of lines i and ii and lines iv and v. In agreement with von Soden, he also interprets line vi as referring to the taking up of Christ by men through their faith and worship.

In considering A. Seeberg's view, we must agree with J.E. Belser:⁹⁰ "Die neue Auffassung ist geistvoll zu nennen, aber sie löst die Schwierigkeit nicht und schafft neue." The difficulty which remains from von Soden's view is the interpretation of line vi as referring to the glorification of Christ by men.⁹¹ The new difficulty consists in his interpreting line iii as referring to the Apostles. Only by maintaining these two doubtful interpretations can he speak of the first three lines as describing the life of Christ on earth, and the last three lines as describing his confirmation

89. *Op. Cit.*, pp. 116ff. He is referring here to the introductory statement: "great is the mystery of godliness".

90. *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus an Timotheus und Titus*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1907, p. 91.

91. *Supra*, p. 40.

in the world. E. Norden also finds difficulty in accepting lines i - iii as the Vordersatz and lines iv - vi as the Nachsatz:⁹²

"Die Annahme...daß ὅς - ἀγγέλους der relativische Vordersatz sei, ἐκηρύχθη - δόξα der Nachsatz ('er, der...gesehen wurde von den Engeln, er wurde verkündet' usw.), erscheint mir stilistisch nicht leicht, da der Übergang vom Vordersatz zum Nachsatz durch nichts markiert ist, wozu doch gerade wegen der parallel laufenden Kommata Anlaß gewesen wäre".

Norden continues his discussion by suggesting that if there had been ground to accept I.3.16b as organized according to Hellenistic 'Kunstprosa', there is now ground for him to reject this view since "es fehlt das entscheidende Kriterium dieses Stils: die Gliederung." Only the first two lines with the antithetical concepts of flesh and spirit could correspond to the requirements of a "wirklich antiken ἰσοκωλον". Moreover, he misses the presence of the correlative particles μέν - δέ throughout the form. Norden suggests that the attempt to arrange the last four lines in pairs one after another fails, since the ἐν is missing in line iii. He concludes:⁹³

"Es sind offenbar sechs einander parallel laufende Glieder ohne eigentliche Gruppierung: das aber ist dem hellenischen Satzparallelismus, der auf dem Prinzipie formaler Gliederung beruht, ebenso zuwider, wie es dem hebräischen Gedankenparallelismus entspricht".

This 'hebräischen Gedanken-parallelismus' is also supported by the fact that the verbs come first in the six lines, a characteristic of semitic parallelism.⁹⁴

92. Op. Cit., pp. 255f., n. 6.

93. Ibid., p. 256f.

94. For a full discussion of this characteristic of semitic parallelism, Ibid., pp. 257ff. and Anhang V.

This insight as to the place of the verb in semitic parallelism in contrast to hellenistic parallelism is an important contribution to the analysis of form and should have some bearing on the analysis of history (Chap. III) as well. But it is difficult to agree with Norden that the rules governing 'Kunstprosa' in the first century were so rigid that a grouping of some kind is not found in I.3.16b. In II Tim. 2.11-12 (13), there is an example of antithetical parallelism and grouping in pairs. However, the passage does not display what Norden would describe as a "wirklich antiken ισόκωλον". Nor does it include the particles μέν - δέ. Moreover, if the last line is included in the traditional form, it is quite out of character with the parallelism of the rest of II Tim. 2.11-13a.⁹⁵ Therefore, to say that the arrangement of the last four lines in pairs must be rejected because of the absence of ἐν in line iii appears to be too rigid a guideline.

ii - The 3x2 arrangement in more recent discussion:

In 1913, M. Dibelius' commentary on the Pastoral Epistles was first printed; and although it has been significantly expanded in later editions by himself and H. Conzelmann, the first edition was a turning point in the interpretation of I.3.16b. According to Dibelius, I.3.16b should be viewed not as a chronological enumeration of 'Heilstatsachen' since line vi is obviously out of order in such an arrangement, but as a series of antithetical parallel lines in chiastic order

95. For an excellent discussion of II Tim. 2.11-13, see the unpublished thesis by I-Jin Loh, Op. Cit.

contrasting the 'irdischer' and 'himmlischer' spheres of existence. In other words, he views the structure essentially as de Wette did back in 1844.⁹⁶

But Dibelius finds two difficulties with this viewpoint: the interpretations of lines ii and iii. It is at this point that he takes into serious account what he considers to be historical perspective of the form. By suggesting that ἐδικαιώθη carries the Hellenistic meaning of 'divinized',⁹⁷ he interprets line ii as referring to the entrance of Christ into the divine sphere and line iii to his triumph over the Spirit-world. He notes that such patterns of thought can be found in other religions of that day.⁹⁸

Hence, Dibelius added a history-of-religions dimension to his analysis of the form.⁹⁹ Since his commentary, scholars have been more aware of the historical dimensions of the form and their implications as to the structure and sequence of the lines. Thus, it is important to have more continuity of thought at this point in this historical survey in order to analyze the role of this new dimension of thought in later analyses. In this regard, it is interesting to

96. Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus (HzNT), Tübingen, 1913, p. 165. For de Wette's view, supra, p. 34.

97. He finds the closest parallel in Ign. ad Phil. 8.2, where he interprets δικαιωθῆναι as having the approximate meaning of θεοῦ ἐπιτυχεῖν.

98. Ibid.

99. Before Dibelius, F.C. Baur (supra, pp. 31f.) was the only scholar to really allow historical considerations to play so decisive a role in determining the structure of I.3.16b.

note that most scholars who have emphasized the historical dimensions of the form have also accepted the general 3x2 arrangement. Moreover, since it is important to make a more critical evaluation of each of the three accepted arrangements of I.3.16b - the 3x2 arrangement, the 2x3 arrangement, and the chronological arrangement - the investigation of the historical analysis of the form will proceed within each of the separate, respective arrangements.

E. Norden continued Dibelius' line of thought in his Die Geburt des Kindes written in 1924, in which he revised his former view of 1912. Finding the same formal structure as Dibelius, Norden suggests that I.3.16b was influenced by the form of an ancient Egyptian Coronation Ceremony.¹⁰⁰

J. Jeremias, who follows Norden at this point, summarizes his discussion of the ceremony as follows:¹⁰¹

"Das altägyptische Thronbesteigungs-Zeremoniell nämlich besteht aus drei Akten: 1. der neue König erhält in feierlicher Sinnbildhandlung göttliche Eigenschaft (Erhöhung); 2. der nunmehr vergottete König wird dem Kreise der Götter vorgestellt (Präsentation); 3. danach erst wird ihm die Herrschaft übertragen (Inthronisation)."

According to Jeremias, this pattern of Exaltation - Presentation - Enthronement is to be found in lines i - ii, iii - iv and v - vi respectively, a sequence which takes place before both the earthly and the heavenly worlds (in a chiasmic pattern).¹⁰²

100. Die Geburt des Kindes, Darmstadt, 1958³ (originally 1924), pp. 116-128, esp. 127f.

101. Op. Cit., 1934¹, p. 17.

102. Ibid., pp. 17f. Infra, Chap. III, Sec. B. 1.

This conception of a "coronation hymn" is taken over by C. Spicq. He also suggests that this hymn was the Christian answer to "Great is Artemis of the Ephesians" (Acts 19.28, 34), and praises the God of the Christians in contrast to the Ephesian deity. For evidence of this connection, Spicq suggests that σάρξ and πνεῦμα could build a contrast to the origin of the Artemis-cult in which one finds the myth of the fallen stone from heaven; and the world-wide proclamation of Christ could be set over against the apparent ecumenical pretensions of the Artemis-cult which could be inferred from Acts 19.27.¹⁰³

More recently, R. Deichgräber has reiterated Norden's hypothesis. In fact, he uses it as the reason why line vi comes last in the hymn and not earlier. While the position of ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ may be due simply to poetic license with the closing 'in glory' being more suitable for the ending, the more likely reason why this phrase occurs last in the hymn is due to the use of 'das Ritual der Thronbesteigung' in which the real climax 'in glory' comes at the end. Deichgräber would change, however, Jeremias' term for the first stage of this ritual from 'Erhöhung' to 'Designation', and he admits that "die Designation ist hier nur angedeutet in dem auffälligen ἐδίκαιώθη".¹⁰⁴

103. Op. Cit., 1947¹, pp. 105 ff. See also D.M. Stanley, Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology, Romae, 1961, p. 237; Gealy, Op. Cit., p. 423.

104. Op. Cit., p. 134. Although G. Holtz (Op. Cit., pp. 90ff.) does not quote Jeremias or Norden and does not use the word 'Thronbesteigungshymnus', he still describes the 3x2 structure with the terms: Erhöhung, Präsentation and Inthronisation.

In the historical analysis below (Chap. III), reasons will be given as to why the present writer has serious doubts about this hypothesis. While there are some similarities of thought to be found, there are differences as well. It may be that any resemblance of thought is superficial and coincidental.¹⁰⁵ R.H. Gundry writes:¹⁰⁶

"...there are difficulties in working out the parallels. Manifestation in flesh, with the connotation of human weakness and limitation, does not tally with exaltation unless it be claimed that line 1 merely sets the stage for the exaltation in line 2. Even then, 'taken up in glory' at the end (line 6) sounds closer to the elevation which comes first in the Egyptian ceremony as reconstructed by Spicq and Jeremias. Also, although 'seen by angels' may be comparable to presentation to the gods, proclamation to the nations on earth is doubtfully similar. And although the enthronement of Christ in the hearts of believers is a fine devotional thought, it is again doubtful that 'believed on in (the) world' parallels the final stage in the Egyptian ceremony, viz. enthronement".

There is also the problem of whether or not this three-fold coronation ceremony actually existed in ancient Egypt. H.W. Fairman writes:¹⁰⁷

"No connected account of an Egyptian coronation has survived and at best the reliefs give us only a selection of the more significant items, and even the exact order of the ceremonies is uncertain".

E. Schweizer supposes that Norden is referring to the Hermetic literature in which the order and content were somewhat different from Norden's reconstruction.¹⁰⁸ But Norden is

105. J.N.D. Kelly, Op. Cit., pp. 92f.

106. Op. Cit., pp. 207-8. G. Lohfink (Die Himmelfahrt Jesu, München, 1971, p. 88) adds: "...man in dem abschließenden ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ überhaupt nichts von einem spezifischen Inthronisationsvorgang zu sehen vermag".

107. "The Kingship Rituals of Egypt", Myth, Ritual, and Kingship, ed. S.H. Hooke, Oxford, 1958, p. 78.

108. Lordship and Discipleship, London, 1960, p. 66, n. 1. Schweizer is referring here to a four-fold pattern

[Contd.]



referring to ancient Egyptian coronation ceremonies and not to patterns which are found in the 2nd or 3rd centuries A.D.

Finally, C.F.D. Moule contends:¹⁰⁹

"It requires...some degree of stretching to extract this particular pattern from I Tim. iii.16, where, after all, the only explicit reference to elevation is at the end, not the beginning! It is, as a matter of fact, notoriously difficult to squeeze these six lines at all convincingly into conformity with any logical pattern, whether one takes them as a couple of triplets or a triplet of couplets; and perhaps we shall have to admit that the ardour of adoration is not always logical or even symmetrical".

For these reasons it is doubtful that the three-fold scheme which Norden contends is to be found in the texts of ancient Egypt should be used in the present analysis to determine the structure of I.3.16b. The basis for accepting the 3x2 structure must be dependent upon some other criteria.

A modification of this 'Thronbesteigungsschema' has been recently proposed by E. Schweizer.¹¹⁰ On the one hand, he suggests there is present in the first two lines of I.3.16b a reflection of the Judaic pattern of the 'humiliation/exaltation' of the Righteous One. On the other hand, the two phrases ἐν σαρκί and ἐν πνεύματι designate the two halves of the cosmos, the two spheres of existence, one below and the other above. This stands in contrast to the Judaic concepts of atoning death and resurrection found in I

Contd.] R.P. Festugière (La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, Vol. III, Paris, 1953, p. 149) finds in Corpus Hermeticum I. 24-6. But this particular passage has nothing to do with a coronation ceremony, but describes in gnostic terms what happens to the 'nous' after death.

109. Op. Cit., p. 24.

110. Lordship, pp. 64ff.; Erniedrigung, pp. 62ff.; Neotestamentica, pp. 122ff. Infra, Chap. III, Sec. B. 4.

Corinthians 15.3ff., and is patterned after the Hellenistic spatial concepts of earth and heaven.¹¹¹ He writes:¹¹²

"Die schauerliche, unheilschwangere Scheidung der irdischen Welt von der himmlischen ist aufgehoben: 'er ward offenbart im Fleisch'. Und das war keine Täuschung; er war nicht einer der vielen, die Herren zu sein nur beanspruchen: 'er ward als der rechte erwiesen im Geist' (in der himmlischen Sphäre)".

He continues:¹¹³

"Im Triumphzug hat er die ganze Reihe der Engel und Gewalten durchschritten: 'er erschien den Engeln'. Im Triumphzug hat er den ganzen Kosmos durchzogen: 'er ward verkündet den Völkern'. Als Sieger ist er davon zurückgekehrt: 'er ward geglaubt im Kosmos'. So ist er an die Stelle der Heimarmene getreten und hat alle Gewalt und Herrlichkeit übernommen: 'er ward aufgenommen in Herrlichkeit'."

Thus, the last four lines describe "the triumphal procession of the exalted one through the terrestrial and celestial spaces", terminating in the worship of heaven and earth, thereby effecting the unity of both spheres of existence.¹¹⁴ In this way, line vi is seen to be the 'logical conclusion' of the form.

In some ways, this view reflects the prior analysis of R. Bultmann, which suggested that I.3.16b was patterned after the Gnostic Redeemer-myth. According to Bultmann's view, I.3.16b provides in proper order an account of the redeemer's journey as he travelled from earth to the heavenly sphere.¹¹⁵

111. Cf. the summary of R.P. Martin, "Aspects of Worship...", p. 24.

112. Erniedrigung, p. 155.

113. Ibid.

114. Lordship, p. 65.

115. Theology of the New Testament, trans. K. Grobel, London, 1968 (Germ. edd. - 1949-53): I. pp. 174-8; II, pp. 149-54. Infra, Chap. III, Sec. B. 2.

There is also the view of R.H. Fuller which suggests that I.3.16b is patterned after the concept of the Hellenistic divine man.¹¹⁶ In contrast to the three successive stages of E. Norden's 'Thronbesteigungsschema', the views of Schweizer, Bultmann and Fuller emphasize simply the progressive order of the lines as they describe Christ's triumphant procession to the throne over both spheres of existence.

However, it is doubtful that the present analysis should use any of these patterns to help determine the structure of I.3.16b. In general, it may be stated that the dependence of I.3.16b upon the Gnostic Redeemer-myth or the Hellenistic divine man is very questionable. This will be demonstrated below in the analysis of history (Chap. III). More specifically, there are several problems barring the acceptance of Schweizer's analysis. First, R.H. Fuller shows that in contrast to the 'humiliation' of the incarnate life in Phil. 2,6ff. where the "divine glory is not revealed, but hidden", line 1 of I.3.16b "is a manifestation of the divine glory. It is not a kenosis but an epiphany..."¹¹⁷ In other words, line 1 cannot be limited exclusively to 'humiliation', but has an element of glory as well.¹¹⁸

Second, it is questionable whether the spatial contrast in the form is as strong as Schweizer suggests. R.H. Gundry writes:¹¹⁹

116. The Foundations of New Testament Christology, London, 1969, pp. 216ff., 227ff. Infra, Chap. III, Sec. B. 3.

117. Ibid., p. 217.

118. See also J.M. Robinson's (A New Quest of the Historical Jesus, London, 1968, p. 53, n. 1) criticism of Schweizer in this regard.

119. Op. Cit., p. 217.

"Even where it looks most apparent - viz., in lines 5 and 6,... - it is subdued; for 'glory' does not refer to a place, heaven, but to a condition, the accompanying circumstance of the shekinah-cloud at the ascension ...The only spatial contrast comes from the verb 'was taken up' in relation to the preceding phrase, 'in the world'. But that is no more 'Hellenistic' than the description of Elijah's translation: 'And Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven...(4 Kg. 2:11)".

Gundry also points out that in first century Palestine, Judaic and Hellenistic concepts were not all that different, due to the dialogue that had been taking place through the Hellenistic invasion of Palestine and the 'Diaspora'. Moreover, ἐν σαρκί and ἐν πνεύματι in the form "do not refer to the earthly and heavenly spheres of existence so much as to the specific flesh and spirit of Christ..."¹²⁰

Third, it appears possible that Schweizer's attitude to the contents of I.3.16b governed his formal-analysis. His book, Erniedrigung und Erhöhung, seeks to trace the generalized pattern of the lowly suffering of the Righteous One followed by some manner of exaltation through older Jewish sources, finding it in some of the other accepted confessional and hymnic elements in the New Testament as well. This search for the pattern of humiliation/exaltation in the canonical and non-canonical sources may have led him to the conclusion that it was to be found in I.3.16b. But the lack of emphasis with regard to the 'humiliation' motif in line 1 suggests that the pattern is being imposed upon the form.

120. Ibid., pp. 216-8. Although more emphasis should be placed on the spatial than on the personal connotations of these two phrases (in contrast to Gundry), the point may still be made that the spatial cannot be emphasized to the exclusion of the personal (infra, pp. 133ff.). For an analysis of Schweizer's view, infra, Chap. III, Sec. B. 4.

Therefore, the basis for accepting the 3x2 structure of I.3.16b in this analysis should not rest on the 'humiliation/exaltation' pattern which Schweizer proposes.

Nevertheless, there are strong indications that I.3.16b is structured according to the 3x2 arrangement. The contrast of ἐν σαρκί and ἐν πνεύματι suggests that they stand in parallel relation to each other. The question is raised, therefore, whether lines iii and iv, v and vi, or lines iv and v also stand in parallel relation. W. Stenger observes that while the substantives in lines i and ii are singular, the substantives in lines iii and iv are plural, and in lines v and vi again singular.¹²¹ However, whereas lines i and ii relate directly to the person of Christ - ἐν σαρκί and ἐν πνεύματι - lines v and vi use universal, comprehensive terms - ἐν κόσμῳ and ἐν δόξῃ. Hence, there is a progression from one - many - all. Moreover, if this three-fold parallelism of the form is accepted, there appears to be a natural contrast between two spheres of existence, one below and the other above. One may object, however, that this involves a chiasmic arrangement of the lines. But excellent examples of chiasmus can be found throughout the Canon. This has been thoroughly demonstrated by N.W. Lund in his thesis, Chiasmus in the New Testament.¹²²

R.H. Gundry also observes that in lines i and ii, iii and iv, v and vi, there is not only a contrast between the two spheres of existence, but also a progression of "roughly

121. "Der Christushymnus in 1 Tim. 3,16", Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift, 78 (1, '69), pp. 33-48.

122. Chapel Hill, 1942. See also E. Schweizer's discussion, Neotestamentica, p. 126, n. 7.

synonymous ideas". Lines i and ii emphasize revelatory action, lines iii and iv denote publication or announcement, and lines v and vi indicate the welcome reception; and all this takes place on two spheres of existence.¹²³ Along this line of approach, it could be argued that there is a certain chronological sequence involved: revelatory action suggests 'commencement', publication is that which takes place after revelation and before reception, and reception suggests 'completion'. In other words, the form may progress from the historical Jesus to the proclamation and presentation of Christ to the final eschatological redemption of all things. This would help clarify for some the problem of chronology which many scholars think plays a role in the order of the form.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the 3x2 arrangement continues to stand even when the most difficult lines (ii and iii) are interpreted in a way which makes a chastic arrangement impossible. For instance, Heydenreich could interpret ἐν πνεύματι as Christ's 'divine nature' and ἀπ' ἀποστόλων as 'apostles' and still hold strongly to the 3x2 structure. More recently, H. Zimmermann has suggested an entirely novel way of viewing the form while retaining the 3x2 structure:¹²⁴

123. Op. Cit., p. 208. This suggestion was anticipated by J. Weiss (supra, p. 41). W. Hendriksen (Op. Cit., p. 139) suggests that one should view the parallelism not as antithetic, but as 'chiastic, cumulative parallelism'. For while the form pictures a series of regional contrasts, the thought throughout is that of glory and adoration, from his 'manifestation' (though humble in form) to his 'ascension'. Hence, it is 'cumulative' parallelism.

124. Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre, Stuttgart, 1968², p. 212; see pp. 209-212.

"Die Glieder der ersten Reihe [lines i, iii and vi] sprechen von dem Weg Christi: 'Er wurde offenbar im Fleische' denkt an sein irdisch-menschliches Leben, 'Er erschien den Engeln' hat seine Auferstehung im Blick [the angels were the first to see him], 'Er wurde aufgenommen in Herrlichkeit' ist auf seine Verherrlichung gerichtet. Die Glieder der zweiten Reihe haben den Heilsweg Christi zum Inhalt [lines ii, iv and v] - das, was mit ihm auf die Menschen hin geschehen ist: 'Er wurde gerechtfertigt im Geist', 'Er wurde verkündet unter den Völkern', 'Er wurde geglaubt in der Welt'.

Die Glieder der ersten Reihe bilden eine Abfolge des Geschehens: irdisches Leben, Auferstehung, Verherrlichung. Auch bei den Gliedern der zweiten Reihe handelt es sich um eine Abfolge: Dem Gerechtfertigtwerden im Geiste folgt die Verkündigung unter den Völkern, der Verkündigung folgt das Geglaubtwerden in der Welt".

This suggests the following outline:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| i - <u>ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί</u> | ii - <u>ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι</u> |
| iii - <u>ᾤφθη ἀγγέλοις</u> | iv - <u>ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν</u> |
| vi - <u>ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ</u> | v - <u>ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ</u> |

The explanation as to why lines v and vi are 'umgestellt' is that "der Ton des Liedes zumeist auf dem Sieg und darum auf dem Liedschluß liegt".¹²⁵ It appears to this writer that this view of the structure has great merit emphasizing not so much the place where these actions occurred as the soteriological meaning of the life of Christ for mankind. The difficulty of this view is the interpretation of line iii as referring to the angels present after Christ's resurrection. Some would also question Zimmermann's interpretation of line ii where he extends the interpretation of ἐδικαιώθη to refer to the forgiveness of sins effected upon the cross, and ἐν πνεύματι to the Spirit convincing the κόσμος of δικαιοσύνη. However, the discussion of these questions can be deferred

125. Ibid., p. 209.

until the appropriate sections of the analysis of language (Chap. II).¹²⁶ For the purpose at present is only to consider in general the 3x2 structure and to demonstrate that it is flexible enough to allow some differences of interpretation in the most difficult lines of the form, lines ii and iii.

Therefore, the evidence for the 3x2 arrangement of the six lines is very strong: the contrast of ἐν σαρκί and ἐν πνεύματι; the progression of the substantives in pairs from one - many - all; the simultaneous progression of "roughly synonymous ideas" in pairs from revelatory action - publication - reception; and the apparent contrast within the pairs of two spheres of existence in chiasmic order.¹²⁷

126. *Ibid.*, p. 211. *Infra*, pp. 120f., 143ff.

127. Two other interesting points of view with reference to the 3x2 structure may be noted. H.A. Blair (*A Creed Before the Creeds*, London, 1955) advances the theory that the order of the three stanzas is based on the early Christian homologia "Jesus (i and ii) Christ (iii and iv) is Lord (v and vi)." F.J. Badcock (*The Pauline Epistles*, London, 1937, pp. 126, 134) proposes that "the hymn in I Tim. 3.16 can be shown to be a translation into Greek from the Aramaic, consisting in the original of three couplets of ten syllables each", and he concludes his discussion by restoring the probable original Aramaic hymn.

dēthgli vavsar

4 syllables

ὅς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί

wēzdaddak brūh

[καὶ] ἐδικκιώθη ἐν πνεύματι

wēthhzi lmalachē

[καὶ] ᾤφθη ὑπέδαυσεν

wethkrez bēth 'ammē

5 syllables

[καὶ] ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν

wēthhaiman b'ālmā

[καὶ] ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ

wēstallak bshuvhā

[καὶ] ἐνεδόξασεν ἐν δόξῃ

[Contd.]

However, it is important to proceed now to evaluate the other two arrangements of the form in order to determine whether they provide any evidence which could modify or change the acceptance of this 3x2 structure.

iii - The 2x3 arrangement in more recent discussion:

According to this view, the form is to be divided into two strophes, the first three lines relating to the life of Christ and the last three lines dwelling upon the effect of his life in the world below and in heaven above. It is within this general structure that the following viewpoints may be grouped together with their variations and expanded interpretations.¹²⁸

On the continent in 1928, E. Lohmeyer in his Kyrios Jesus argued for this structure of the form. For Lohmeyer, the first three lines present an historical, even chronological, account of the "Werk des Christus". The last three lines describe "die Wirkung dieses Daseins und Werkes", setting forth not historical facts but "vollendete eschatologische Tatsache". Thus, line iv refers not to the missionary pro-

Contd.] That the Greek of I.3.16b could be easily retroverted into Aramaic would not necessarily prove in and by itself that the form was originally Aramaic. The difficulty of this theory is that it fails to explain why the Greek has the more lyrical form (supra, pp. 16ff.). According to R.H. Gundry (Op. Cit., p. 221, n. 5): "I am not inclined to posit an Aramaic or Hebrew Vorlage, mainly because a putative Aramaic or Hebrew form cannot match the series of Greek verbal endings in -en, which seem to be original to the hymn. Also, κένεν lacks a sufficient equivalent".

128. In the analysis above, we considered the arrangements of J.E. Huther (pp. 36f.), H. von Soden (p. 40), J.P. Lilley (pp. 43f.) and A. Seeberg (pp. 44ff). Although we observed several difficulties with the views of the latter three scholars, no evaluation as of yet has been made of Huther's arrangement. This will be included in the discussion which follows.

clamation of the early church but to the perfection of the divine work of Christ which is passed on to all people; line v is poetically descriptive of the 'Bekenntnis des Alls' which is found in Philippians 2.11; and line vi concludes with his 'Inthronisation'.¹²⁹ But the difficulty of Lohmeyer's interpretation in which he separates the historical work of Christ from its eschatological effect is seen by R. Deichgräber, who writes:¹³⁰

"Aber hier wird Zusammengehöriges auseinandergerissen. Die Gliederung erweist sich als Konstruktion. Das Stück ist eine Einheit".

Moreover, it is doubtful that lines iv and v can be so limited as not to relate to the historical proclamation and reception of Christ in the world. In this light, it could be argued that it is Lohmeyer's interpretation and not just the structure itself which tends to pull the form apart.

Although W. Lock does not regard his view as certain, he thinks that the 2x3 arrangement is the more probable structure of the form. He suggests that the two groups balance each other out, contrasting the 'incarnate' with the 'ascended Lord'.¹³¹

I) The life of the incarnate -

- a) as seen on earth, ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί
ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι
- b) as watched from heaven, ἔφθην ἰσχυρίσας

129. Kyrios Jesus, Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2, 5-11, Heidelberg, 1928, (reprinted in Darmstadt, 1961), p. 63.

130. Op. Cit., p. 136, n. 5.

131. Op. Cit., p. 45.

II) The life of the ascended Lord -

- a) as preached on earth, ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν
ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ
- b) as lived in heaven, ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ

Note the contrast between this arrangement and that of Huther's:¹³²

<u>earth</u>	<u>heaven</u>
i - manifested in the flesh	
ii - justified in the spirit	iii - appeared to angels
iv - preached in the nations	
v - believed in the world	vi - taken up in glory

E.F. Scott goes one step further by separating lines iii and vi from lines i and ii, iv and v, and referring to them as refrains:¹³³

<u>verses</u>	<u>refrains</u>
I) Christ's life on earth	
i - manifested in the flesh	
ii - justified in the spirit	iii - appeared to angels
II) Christ's life in the Church	
iv - preached in the nations	
v - believed in the world	vi - taken up in glory

For Scott, the refrains conclude each verse with a note of triumph.¹³⁴

132. Supra, p. 36.

133. The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 41ff.

134. Cf. B.S. Easton (Op. Cit., pp. 136f), who follows Scott, adds a history of religious dimension onto the form: "Lying back of the concepts in the hymn is the myth of the 'Incognito Redeemer', widespread and popular in the Hellenistic world, which was adopted by the Christians as at least a partial means for expressing something of the significance of Christ". W.J. Dalton (Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits, Rome, 1965, p. 90) also follows Scott, though he interprets line vi as referring to the same event as line iii, the ascension. Cf. also J. Moffatt, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, Edinburgh, 1918, p. 58.

With the exception of Lock's interpretation of line iii, all three arrangements appear to be very similar. Of course, Scott refers to lines iii and vi as 'refrains', and variations could be found in their interpretations of some of the lines. But in general the comparison is strikingly similar. In favour of this 2x3 structure, it may be said that lines iv and v appear to belong together, and lines iii and vi which are very much alike are singled out for special attention from the other four lines. R. Falconer also finds that the respective lines of each of the two strophes are parallel:¹³⁵

i - Christ manifested.....	iv - Christ proclaimed
ii - Sonship justified.....	v - Sonship acknowledged
iii - Homage from heavenly world.	vi - Homage in heavenly world

Nevertheless, this arrangement has its problems as well. First, with reference to Falconer's parallelism, R.H. Gundry writes:¹³⁶

"Once again, however, the pairs of antitheses at the ends of the lines do not receive enough attention. Indeed, Falconer's scheme would link '(Christ's) flesh' and 'nations', 'spirit' and 'world', and 'angels' and 'glory'. All except the last are unlikely combinations, especially when the antitheses 'flesh/spirit', 'angels/nations', and 'world/glory' are ready to hand".

Second, line ii (according to this arrangement) must refer to some aspect of the life of Christ 'on earth'. Although such an interpretation is not impossible, it is more probable that ἐν πνεύματι stands in contrast to his manifestation ἐν σαρκί, thereby taking the interpretation out of this sphere

135. Op. Cit., p. 138. Cf. M. Albertz (Die Botschaft des Neuen Testaments, Vol. I/2, Zollikon/Zürich, 1952, p. 132), who also correlates lines i and iv, ii and v, iii and vi with reference to Christ and the church respectively.

136. Op. Cit., p. 206.

of existence.¹³⁷ Finally, this view appears to overlook other probable parallels such as angels/nations and world/glory. It is important here not to use a circular argument.¹³⁸ But the exponents of the 2x3 scheme do not appear to have an open mind as to the possibility of any further parallelism. In fact, by failing to comment on the continuity of thought between lines iii and iv, they have a tendency - as was the case in Lohmeyer's interpretation - to pull the form apart; and by placing lines iii and vi in heaven far removed from what precedes them, they encourage Scott to separate lines iii and vi from the remaining four lines as 'refrains'. This 'auseinandergerissen' is not supported grammatically, and there is a valid alternative contentwise, the parallelism of the 3x2 scheme. Ultimately, the exponents of the 2x3 structure must reckon with the grammatical parallelism and the parallelism of content which has been outlined above (pp. 56ff.).

Therefore, because of the difficulties involved in the 2x3 arrangement, the 3x2 arrangement is to be preferred. But it is important to keep in mind the continuity of lines iv and v and the similarity of lines iii and vi.

iv - The chronological arrangement in more recent discussion:

In the analysis above, it was noted how many scholars regard the sequence of the six lines as in some sense 'chronological'. One 19th century scholar in particular - H. Alford -

137. Infra, Chap. II, Sec. B. 1. c. 2).

138. It could be argued, for instance, that the following statement by R.H. Gundry (Ibid., p. 205) is a circular argument, since he appears to accept a priori the 3x2
[Contd.]

viewed the form as patterned exclusively according to a chronological sequence. For Alford, the six lines refer to the chief events in Jesus' life from his birth to his ascension. But the problems of relating the six lines to precise events in the life of Jesus were also observed.¹³⁹

More recently, three scholars have supported the chronological arrangement of the form, though they have altered their positions from Alford's. A. Schlatter also views the six lines as a description of Jesus' life from his birth to his ascension. But the purpose of this account is to arouse one's amazement at both the mystery and the miracle of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. That God became visible in 'flesh', that Jesus was raised from the dead through the Spirit and is now the ever-Present One, that he was seen by angels following the resurrection, that his Gospel is proclaimed and believed because of the miracle of the historical Jesus, and that he has been taken up in glory - all this is the wonderful work of God, a mystery which has its utmost repercussions in the lives of men:¹⁴⁰

"Nun ist es offenkundig, ein ἡμολογούμενον, daß das Geheimnis des Gottesdienstes groß ist, da dieser daraus entstanden ist, daß Jesus so offenbar, so gerechtfertigt, so verkündet und so erhöht worden ist".

In this light, the form has direct relevance to the preceding context:¹⁴¹

Contd.] structure which the exponents of this view do not accept: "...the second of the three antitheses 'flesh/spirit', 'angels/nations', and 'world/glory' breaks down any strict division into two strophes by bridging the supposed boundary between them".

139. Supra, pp. 37ff.

140. Die Kirche der Griechen im Urteil des Paulus, Stuttgart, 1936, p. 114; see pp. 113ff.

141. Ibid., pp. 115f.

"...was die Ämter der Kirche sind, hängt von dem ab, was die Kirche ist, und was die Kirche ist, hängt von dem ab, was der Christus ist, und die Geschichte des Christus ist die unbegreiflich große göttliche Wundertat".

By viewing I.3.16b in this way, Schlatter has brought new dimensions into our understanding of the form of I.3.16b. His interpretation brings more 'life' and 'meaning' into the words of the six lines. For the arrangement is viewed not so much as a chronological succession of events, but as the progression of the wonderful revelation of God in Jesus Christ which is characterized throughout the form by an implicit dialectic between 'mystery' and 'miracle'. It also helps to explain the presence of the 'mission motif' in lines iv and v. But his analysis of the structure has problems as well. There is the ever-present problem that specific events do not in fact stand out clearly in the form. In this regard, it is doubtful that line iii refers to the angels after his resurrection as we shall see below in the analysis of language (Chap. II). The fact that lines iv and v were not really accomplished (aorist tense) during Jesus' lifetime makes it very difficult to limit the chronological arrangement from Jesus' birth to his ascension.

For this reason, C.K. Barrett thinks it is best to recognize a chronological progression of thought extending from the incarnation to the final victory (Parousia) to come. Thus, there is the following sequence:¹⁴²

¹⁴². Op. Cit., pp. 65f.

- lines i - the incarnation
- ii - the resurrection
- iii - the ascension
- iv - the mission of the church
- v - the success of that mission
- vi - the final exaltation

Barrett admits that there is a problem of lines iii and vi being interpreted of the same event, the ascension. As R.H. Gundry notes:¹⁴³

"... 'taken up in glory' most naturally refers to the ascension rather than the consummation. Indeed, ἀναλαμβάνω describes the ascension in Acts 1:2, 11, 22 (and Mark 16:19), and in view of these parallels the noun ἀνάληψις almost certainly refers to the ascension in Luke 9:51 (cf. 24:51)".

Of course, the whole phrase may include more than Christ's ascension, but since 'taken up' must at least imply the ascension, the chronological problem remains. Moreover, Barrett's interpretation, like those of Alford and Schlatter, relates the lines to specific events in the life of Christ, whereas the lines are not at all clear in this regard.

J.B. Rowell attempts to overcome this problem by viewing the lines as a "sixfold history of Jesus Christ", that is, as six aspects of the life of Jesus Christ. Line i refers not only to his birth but to his continued manifestation through his entire life; line ii refers to his constant vindication by the Holy Spirit "at His baptism, in His miracle working, in the casting out of demons, at Pentecost, and in the conviction and conversion of sinners"; line iii refers to his contact with the angels from "His pre-existent glory" until "now"; line iv refers to the fact that the proclamation was made possible through the death of Christ, when he "broke down

¹⁴³. Op. Cit., p. 204.

'the middle wall of partition' between Jew and Gentile"; line v is reminiscent of the fact that even from his strongest opposition men came forward to believe on Jesus during his lifetime; and line vi refers to the crowning of the Lord's work and ministry here on earth, the ascension. Rowell concludes:¹⁴⁴

"We have examined the six predicates...and find in them the history of our Lord's earthly life from His incarnation to His exaltation".

But Rowell's interpretation is characterized not so much by a chronological sequence of events as by a series of concise statements which serve as a compendium of past events in the life of Jesus. Moreover, he is inconsistent in his interpretation. Whereas lines i, ii, iii and v refer back to numerous events in the life of Jesus, line vi refers back only to his ascension. Line iv does not refer to a 'proclamation' during his lifetime, but refers to his death which made possible later proclamation. This inconsistency in line iv is accentuated further by line v which he interprets as referring to numerous responses of faith during the life of Jesus and not later.

The difficulty with all these interpretations which attempt to relate the form to a chronological sequence of events is that they are emphasizing the wrong thing. For the believer who chants this 'Bekenntnislied', certain specific events naturally come to mind: Jesus' birth, his life in the flesh, his death, his resurrection, his ascension and present

¹⁴⁴. Op. Cit., p. 76; see pp. 73ff.

Lordship. Line vi may even bring to mind the second coming of Christ, since he is left in heaven whence Christians look for his return.¹⁴⁵ But the consequence of these events, and not the events themselves, is uppermost in the author's mind. This is why no single event in the life of Jesus stands out clearly in any of the six lines, although such words as ἐφανερώθη, ᾤφθη and ἀνελήμφθη are used. This is not to suggest that the author has no use for the events, preferring only the ideas of truth embodied in them; for the lines are richly suggestive of the life of Jesus. But it is to suggest that the form is essentially 'soteriological' in purpose, viewing the person of Christ in terms of the results of his life in flesh, and not simply in terms of his actions.¹⁴⁶

In conclusion, the attempt has been made to clarify the structure of I.3.16b by means of an historical survey of the numerous arrangements thus far suggested. The present writer agrees with the consensus of opinion today that the 3x2 arrangement best reflects the general structure of I.3.16b. Interestingly enough, this was also the conclusion of A.L.C. Heydenreich almost 150 years ago (1826). Scholarship has travelled in a circle, from the 3x2 to the 2x3, and now back to the 3x2 arrangement again. The chronological arrangement of the lines has never received widespread support.¹⁴⁷

145. So. C. Spicq, Op. Cit., p. 110.

146. Infra, pp. 172, 274ff.

147. The 2x3 arrangement, which began with J.E. Huther, thrived under the support of scholars such as H. von Soden, A. Seeberg, W. Lock, E. Lohmeyer and E.F. Scott; but it has all but been abandoned in more recent years.

Furthermore, it appears 'likely' that this 3x2 arrangement exhibits an antithetical parallelism which contrasts two spheres of existence - earth and heaven - in chiastic order. This is not to suggest that the interpretation should try to create a sharp division between these two spheres. For, on the one hand, the grammar strongly suggests that I.3.16b is a literary unit. All six lines stand in the same relation to ὅς, forming a series of co-ordinate relative sentences largely uniform in style. This unity of structure would suggest that there is a unity to be preserved in content as well. However, inherent in this literary unit is the chiastic antithetical parallelism, and the interpretation should also reflect this aspect of the structure.

The difficulty of finding in the six lines any kind of chronological or logical pattern has been observed. The views of H. Alford, M. Dibelius, J. Jeremias, E. Schweizer and others have all been presented and their difficulties discussed. What was the determinative factor in the order of the lines? On the one hand, the presence of some sense of chronology which extends from the 'commencement' of Jesus' manifestation ἐν ἀρχῇ to its 'completion' ἐν δόξῃ is evident, despite the difficulty of identifying any of the lines with specific events in the life of Jesus.¹⁴⁸ On the other hand, while certain events in the life of Jesus may be implicit in the lines, the purpose of the author may have been not to point to the events themselves but to the soteriological consequence of these events.¹⁴⁹ Therefore, it is

148. Supra, p. 57.

149. Supra, pp. 68f.

probable that while chronological considerations may have been a factor in the order of the lines, there were other factors as well, perhaps more important ones, to which one must turn.

One of these other factors was, no doubt, the 3x2 chiasmic antithetical parallelism of the form. Hence, there are not six separate lines for which to account, but three pairs in which each action on earth has its counterpart in heaven. This parallelism lends itself to the more logical sequence of R.H. Gundry in which the first two lines emphasize 'revelatory action', the next two 'publication' or 'announcement', and the last two 'welcome reception'.¹⁵⁰ Moreover, grammatical considerations suggest that the pairs progress from one - many - all.

In contrast to the history of religions perspective of E. Norden and others, this sequence commends itself to objective literary analysis as having been taken out of, rather than forced upon, the form.

C. Conclusion.

The formal analysis attempted to answer three questions to which it addressed itself in the introduction of this chapter. First, it concluded that there is ample evidence to justify the conclusion of scholars that I.3.16b is an inserted traditional pericope. Second, it was found that, while there is no clear-cut demarcation between confession and hymn in the New Testament, the style and themes of I.3.16b

150. Supra, pp. 56f.

suggest that it could have been used as a hymn in the worship of the early church. However, because of its enumeration of various facts of salvation, it is wise to use the term 'hymn' in the broadest sense of the term, i.e. as a 'Bekenntnislied'. For this reason, the term 'form' was used rather than 'hymn' when referring to I.3.16b. Finally, it agreed with the modern consensus of opinion that I.3.16b is structured according to a 3x2 arrangement, which further exhibits a chiastic antithetical parallelism.

The inclusion of the historical survey of views as to the form of I.3.16b served not only to point to the probable structure of the verse, but also to introduce some of the difficult problems of its interpretation. In this regard, several questions were raised which could not be answered strictly within a literary analysis. First, there is the difficulty of interpreting various lines, especially lines ii and iii. It is hoped that the analysis of language to follow in Chapter II will help to answer some of the questions which have been raised in this regard. Second, there is the question as to the background of I.3.16b. The analysis of the structure of I.3.16b was quite limited in scope due to the lack of an intensive analysis of history, which will come in Chapter III. Both the structure and meaning of I.3.16b would have been influenced by its background, and therefore there is a sense in which the conclusions of this analysis of form will need to be re-examined in the light of the later analyses. Third, in view of the diversity of the views surveyed above, one may ask whether it will be at all possible to reach some

agreement as to its interpretation. The conclusion of the thesis will testify as to whether or not this attempt has been successful.

II. AN ANALYSIS OF LANGUAGE

A. Concerning Problem and Method.

The purpose of this analysis of language is to ascertain the meaning of the words and phrases used in I.3.16b. This investigation is both a valid and a necessary enterprise. It is valid because the 'word' is "a semantic marker, a pointer to a concept or field of meaning which must be clarified and understood".¹ It is necessary because words "are not solid unchanging realities like marbles",² always able to be discerned by the passing eye. They are capable of changing their nuances and at times even their meanings in relation to the changing circumstances of history and setting. Therefore, this analysis is an important step forward in the attempt to understand the form, meaning and historical background of I.3.16b.

However, the fruition of this purpose is encumbered with problems. E.F. Scott writes:³

"...the hymn, whatever may be its origin, is a careful composition, in which every word is weighted with meaning".

This may be true; but how to ascertain exactly what each word means in the hymn has baffled researchers thus far. There are several causes for this. First, there is an ambiguity

-
1. D. Hill, Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, Cambridge, 1967, p. 18. Note his clarification and enlargement of this point in pp. 11f, in which he criticises the more mechanistic-positivistic approach to linguistical study.
 2. S. Neill, The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1961, London, 1966, p. 331.
 3. The Pastoral Epistles, London, 1936, p. 42.

resulting from the very nature of the verse. W. Stenger writes:⁴

"...man hat mit der besonderen Art hymnischen Sprechens zu rechnen, das ja nicht logisch deduzierend, sondern preisend, bekennd die Wirklichkeit aussagt."

Because praise and confession arose as a response of faith, the words cannot be expected to have the exactitude they might otherwise have had. In this regard, F. Gealy is pessimistic:⁵

"A precise interpretation of the hymn is not possible because a) it is a fragment and without a context adequate to clarify its meaning; b) as poetic, cryptic, liturgical language, it cannot with certainty be translated back into the prose concepts of which it is a distillate. We are not in a position, therefore, to say just what the hymn meant to its author or even to the letter writer".

Second, there is an ambiguity resulting from the words chosen. This is due primarily to their variable use and definition in the rest of the New Testament. Take, for example, the two very significant words, σῶψ and πνεῦμα, and their use in the Pauline letters. According to H.W. Robinson, σῶψ occurs 91 times and may be classified under five headings:⁶

1. physical structure (12 instances)
2. kinship (11 instances)
3. sphere of present existence (14 instances)
4. weakness (19 instances)
5. ethical experience (35 instances)

4. "Der Christushymnus in I Tim. 3,16", Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift, 78 (1, 1969), p. 36.

5. The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus (IB, XI), Nashville, 1955, p. 421. J.N.D. Kelly (The Pastoral Epistles, London, 1963, p. 90) is more optimistic when he writes: "Since the excerpt is a mere fragment and the language of hymnody tends to be cryptic, it is not possible to identify all of these (clauses) exactly..."

6. The Christian Doctrine of Man, Edinburgh, 1911, pp. 113f.

W.D. Davies, on the other hand, finds a similar variation in Paul's use of πνεῦμα.⁷

1. spirit of man (22 instances)
2. spirit as opposed to flesh (6 instances)
3. Spirit of God (72 instances)
4. Spirit as opposed to the Law and letter (4 instances)
5. spirit denoting a quality or disposition (13 instances)
6. Spirit of Christ (8 instances)
7. spirit of evil or of the world (2 instances)

But this is typical of the variable use and definition of most of the other words in I.3.16b as well.

Moreover, when these terms of a general nature are brought together in a form in which preciseness of definition may not have been intended by its author, it may be questioned whether it is at all possible to ascertain their meaning. This problem is reinforced upon consideration of the possibility that these words, which apparently were frequently used in the early church, conveyed 'overtones of meaning'. We should not be blind to the likelihood, writes N.W. Porteous,⁸

Contd.] Cf. also J. Héring, "Énumération des principales significations du mot 'Sarx' dans les Épîtres Pauliniennes (avec exemples)", Le Royaume de Dieu et sa venue, Neuchâtel/Paris, 1959, pp. 249f; J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, London, 1952.

7. "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit", The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, London, 1958, p. 178. Cf. also E. Schweizer, "Röm. 1,3f, und der Gegensatz von Fleisch und Geist vor und bei Paulus", Neotestamentica, pp. 180ff; E. de Witt Burton (for concise studies on both σὰρξ and πνεῦμα), Galatians (ICC), New York, 1920, pp. 486-95.
8. "Second Thoughts: II. The Present State of Old Testament Theology", ET, 75 (Dec. 1963), pp. 70-4, esp. 71f. An example of an unresolved debate along this line is that which surrounds the use of Isa. 53 in the New Testament. According to J. Jeremias (The Servant of God, London, 1957, pp. 88-98, quote from p. 98), we should not be misled by the limitation of specific quotations in the NT from Isa. 53, but must also consider direct and indirect allusions to the Servant of Isa. in connection with Jesus. Such allusions are found, he suggests, in a pre-Pauline stock of tradition and formulae; in a stock of tradition and formulae in Acts; and in ancient formulae in I Peter and the Johannine

[Contd.]

"...that in the course of their usage certain words became so loaded with theological meaning that a hearer or reader of utterances or passages in which these words occurred would often catch, and was perhaps intended to catch, overtones of meaning. Much of the beauty and significance of poetry depends on the suggestiveness of the words employed, and to come with too try a logic to great literature may sometimes be almost as serious a fault as indulgence in linguistic fallacies and indeed may result in the impoverishment of one's own understanding".

Even J. Barr does not discount this possibility:⁹

"It is true of course that a word may be used in such a way as to suggest some wide area of recognized thought which can be somehow connected with the word but which goes beyond its normal signification. It is however a central lexical problem to determine to what degree this has happened, and this determination can be done only on the basis of the context at given occurrences. It is misleading in other words to suppose that it can be taken for granted that this is always happening".

Contd.] writings. In fact, "there is no area of the primitive Christian life of faith which was not stamped and moulded by the ebed christology". Jeremias' view is supported by H.W. Wolff (Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum, Berlin, 1952, pp. 108ff, 149-150), who argues that the NT writers' use of the OT was 'thematic' rather than 'atomistic'. A person could refer to an entire chapter in the OT by using a few words or thoughts. Only later did writers tend to quote larger portions of the OT, as in I Clement where all of Isa. 53 is quoted. In contrast to this view is that of W. Bousset (Kyrios Christos, Göttingen, 1921, pp. 69, 75), who finds it remarkable that Isa. 53 made so little impression on Christian imagination. H.J. Cadbury ("The Titles of Jesus in Acts", The Beginnings of Christianity, edd. F.J.F. Jackson and K. Lake, Vol. V, 1933, p. 366) also finds little evidence that Isa. 53 played a central role in the interpretation of Christ's death. Moreover, where parts of Isa. 53 are plainly alluded to, it is important not to assume that the whole chapter is in the quoter's mind: "The Christian use of Old Testament passages usually called attention to the actual parts quoted, or even less than the whole quotation, in a quite verbal and literal sense" (p. 369).

9. The Semantics of Biblical Language, London, 1961, p. 217.

Of course, Barr is right not to assume that these 'overtones of meaning' are always there. This can be determined 'only on the basis of the context'. But the possibility is still present.

Further insights as to the problems of semantic inquiry have also been contributed by Prof. Barr. In his work, The Semantics of Biblical Language, Barr reveals the widespread ignorance or neglect of the basic principles of linguistic semantics which is in evidence in so many linguistic analyses. He notes that the etymology of a word is not a reliable guide to its meaning unless it is constantly checked by reference to its current usage. Etymology is a starting-point, but not a controlling power; it is a statement about the history of a word, but not about its meaning.¹⁰

Furthermore, Barr warns against subjecting words to a systematizing method in which the various locations where a word occurs are noted down and then classified according to some pattern which suggests itself to the researcher. On the one hand, the result is the virtual abstraction of the word from its context. On the other hand, the word takes on its meaning in relation to the framework provided by the researcher. The dangers of such a method are obvious. It does not take into account the possibility that a word may have more than one meaning, or that a word may take on other nuances in different contexts. Moreover, it does not guard against the subjective influence of the researcher's theological presuppositions in determining the framework in which the words are

10. Ibid., Chap. 6, esp. pp. 158ff.

assembled. In the process, words which do not fit into the framework are often classified as unimportant or irregular occurrences, or are even omitted from the analysis.¹¹

In this regard, Barr refers to the classification which results from the contrasting of the Hebrew language with the Greek.¹² Many scholars have accepted without hesitation the idea that there is a vast difference of ideas between the Hebraic and the Greek 'Weltanschauung', and that the features of this contrast are built into their respective languages. Then they proceed to use this dichotomy in their analyses of words. Barr is quick to point out not only the faulty linguistic basis for this classification, but also the difficulties that ensue when working under a system which so controls research and conditions conclusions.¹³ This is especially true in relation to any linguistic analysis of I.3.16b. For the attempt to explain words through religio-historical precedents requires a comprehensive examination of the words in relation to their historical setting. But what was the background of I.3.16b? There is no context other than the six lines of the form to help determine its original milieu. Hence, it is inevitable that the historical background attributed to I.3.16b by its various students is to some extent

11. Ibid., esp. Chap. 8, "Some Principles of Kittel's Theological Dictionary".

12. Ibid., Chaps. 2ff. T. Boman's work, Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek, London, 1960, esp. pp. 9, 200f., where the formal peculiarities of each kind of thinking are outlined.

13. Barr claims the purpose of his book is not to question the validity of this contrast (Op. Cit., pp. 13f.). But it may be questioned whether Semitic and Hellenistic concepts in the 1st century A.D. were all that different (infra, pp. 183ff.).

determined by the student's partisan and apologetic concerns and is not derived from textual evidence. Moreover, such an attempt is usually self-defeating, for the eventual effect is to make the form the abstract result of certain influences, thus diverting attention from the concrete historical circumstances in which the form may have been created.

It is the repetition of this faulty methodology which this analysis of language will want to avoid: the false emphasis on etymology; the attempt to fit the occurrences of a word into a neat pattern or theological scheme; the allowance of partisan and apologetic concerns, especially in relation to the distinction between Hebrew and Greek thought, to dominate and prejudice one's use of evidence. But more must be done than simply 'avoid' faulty methodology. A fully contextual analysis is called for which includes the following three interrelated aspects.

1 - The immediate context:

Although the 'word' itself is a proper object of semantic inquiry,¹⁴ it is important to emphasize with J. Barr 'the immediate context' in which the word appears for the interpretation of its meaning:¹⁵

"It is the sentence (and of course the still larger literary complex such as the complete speech or poem) which is the linguistic bearer of the usual theological statement, and not the word (the lexical unit) or the morphological and syntactical connection".

14. Supra, p. 74.

15. Op. Cit., p. 263.

Only in this way is it possible to avoid what Barr calls "illegitimate totality transfer", i.e. the reading into a word a meaning belonging to another occurrence or another author.¹⁶ In order to approach an understanding of the word as it was intended by this author, one must view it within its immediate context.

But it is difficult to implement this dictum of Barr's in the present linguistic analysis of I.3.16b. Not only is the 'larger literary complex' limited to six succinct clauses, but also each successive clause appears to be too short and problematic to correspond adequately to Barr's 'sentence'. However, because the preceding formal analysis concluded that I.3.16b is arranged according to a 3x2 pattern with chiasmic antithetical parallelism, it will be helpful to consider the lines together in pairs, thereby providing a larger (though not too large) context corresponding to his 'sentence'.¹⁷

ii - The historical context:

D. Hill writes:¹⁸

"This involves the realisation that each of the theological terms discussed possessed special content and associations which it had developed in the course of its history and through its use in the Greek of the LXX. These the New Testament authors either accepted, modified or rejected. If they pursued either of the latter two courses, then the investigation of the word's historical usage is essential to discovering the extent of the uniqueness of its meaning in their work: if

16. Ibid., p. 218.

17. For instance, most scholars conclude that line i, ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, refers only to Jesus' 'appearance in human form'. Alone, this is all that could be inferred from this clause. But does it include 'overtones of meaning'? Or, on the other hand, should it be limited to the sense 'realm of the flesh'? Only by viewing it closely in relation to line ii is there the possibility of answering these questions satisfactorily.

18. Op. Cit., p. 19.

they accepted the content which the word possessed at the time of their writing or that which belonged to it at some earlier stage of its development, then the study of historical use is necessary if we are to discover the place and measure of their indebtedness".

For these reasons, no study of the terminology of I.3.16b would be complete without an investigation into their Old Testament equivalents, and their use in Classical Greek and the LXX, and in more contemporary literature such as Philo, the Qumran or Rabbinic teaching.

Together with this more specialized examination of the words, the historical perspective of the form as a whole should be kept in mind. As J.M. Robinson remarks:¹⁹

"...only the most penetrating analysis of the specific historical situation in which the source was written is able to make possible a penetration through the conceptualizations and traditions used to the point being scored, which is really what should be referred to as the theology of the text".

In other words, it is important for the words to be analyzed in relation to the historical situation being addressed. But, again, to implement this principle in the present analysis is difficult. For there is little agreement among scholars concerning either the background or the more specific Sitz im Leben of I.3.16b. The 'historical context' is not to be found simply by means of an analysis of form and a general survey of the lines. Indeed, it is hoped that some conclusions as to the background of I.3.16b will be reached by means

19. "Kerygma and History in the New Testament", The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. J.P. Hyatt, London, 1966, pp. 149f. This historical context must also be regarded as comprehending all the conventions and presuppositions accepted in the social setting in which the author lived, in so far as these are relevant to the understanding of the form. But it is in relation to these non-verbal elements of the historical context that we are the least familiar.

of the present analysis of language, and not vice versa; hence, the order of Chapters II and III.

However, the nature of the form suggests two very important areas within its historical context which should not be neglected in the present analysis of language. First, since I.3.16b is a traditional pericope of the New Testament community, stemming from the Primitive Church, it would appear logical to keep to the central stream of New Testament ideas in order to interpret the form correctly. In this regard, special attention should be given to the Johannine and Pauline literature where the main terms in I.3.16b are so often used. It would in any case be exegetically unwarranted to suppose that the distinction here has quite another meaning from that found elsewhere in the New Testament.²⁰

20. One might object that in referring back to "the central stream of New Testament ideas", we are falling victim to the evils of systematization, and are allowing our dogmatic presuppositions to play a role in shaping our conclusions. However, there is a difference between attempting to assemble all the occurrences of a word in the NT into a harmonizing chorus, and simply referring to the New Testament usage of the words as a very significant part of its historical context. Moreover, it is not necessarily a virtue (if, indeed, it is possible) to sacrifice one's point of view theologically speaking when examining words in the NT. I admit my agreement with C.F.D. Moule (The Birth of the New Testament, London, 1966, p. 167), who, without denying theological development and diversity in the NT, thinks that it basically "debates from a single platform, but from different corners of it". That is, that "each several explanation of the faith or defense of it is likely to run along rather particular lines, according to circumstances. In other words, it may be assumed that, although this activity, taken as a whole, has added considerably to the range of the Christian vocabulary, each separate manifestation of it is likely to be specialized and aimed at solving only one or two particular problems or meeting certain specific objections; and it is here that an explanation may reasonably be sought for some of the curious selectiveness of the N.T." (idem., "The Influence of Circumstances on the Use of Christological Terms", JTS, X (1959), p. 255; cf. R.N. Longenecker, The

Second, since I.3.16b is a 'Christological' formula, it is important to take into consideration the probable effect that knowledge of the historical Jesus had upon the meaning of the words used. Note the conclusion at which D. Hill arrives in the second-to-last paragraph of his thesis on word-studies:²¹

"Barr dismisses as 'romanticism' the contention that Christian faith had a creative and transforming influence on the language used in the New Testament, and favours Deissmann's contention that Christianity had little or no effect on language. Now it is certainly true that too much has been made in the past of the 'language-moulding power' of the Christian faith, but surely Barr has overstated his arguments. The essential Christ-reference of theological terms, which is born out of the Christian faith, has influenced the 'total meaning' of New Testament terms. The Pauline use of the word πνεῦμα is indebted to the Old Testament - Jewish understanding of the 'spirit of Yahweh', but the relation to Christ which the term bears and the experience to which it points as a symbol in Paul's writing and thought are surely added dimensions within the total meaning of the word in the Apostle's usage, dimensions which ought not to be missed if our understanding of the word is to be adequate... (After demonstrating the influence of Christ on the word δικαιοσύνη, Hill continues)...The central figure or event in Christian faith has had an influence on the total meaning of the theological words whose semantics we have been investigating".

Hence, this influence is a very important consideration in a traditional form in which the person of Jesus Christ is the subject.

Contd.] Christology of Early Jewish Christianity, London, 1970, pp. 10ff.). The danger lies not in holding this or that point of view, but in allowing theological presuppositions to 'dominate' and 'prejudice' the evidence. Also, 'unity' must not necessarily be construed to mean 'uniformity'.

21. Op. Cit., pp. 299f. Cf. J. Barr, Op. Cit., p. 263.

iii - Its traditional context:

Since I.3.16b is an early traditional pericope, perhaps best referred to as a 'Bekenntnislied', then the words and phrases used should be evaluated also in the light of their use, or lack of it, in other traditional elements found in the New Testament. Of particular interest in this regard are Rom. 1.3-4 and I Pet. 3.18ff., both of which include the important σάρξ/πνεῦμα contrast, and I Cor. 15.3ff. where ἄφθρ is used as a technical term for the resurrection appearances of Jesus.

Moreover, it is possible that the short, precise, summary-type statements may possess 'overtones of meaning' unwittingly imprisoned by their unique form. That one should be especially aware of this possibility is clear from the following two considerations, one negative and the other positive. First, it is inevitable that once truth is qualified in succinct phrases, a certain blandness and simplicity dampens and inhibits interpretation. Second, in the words of R.P. Martin:²²

"Religious speech tends to be poetic in form; and meditation upon the person and place of Jesus Christ in the Church's cultic life is not expressed in a cold calculating way, but becomes rhapsodic and ornate. This fact should prepare for the correct elucidation of some of the key-terms which the hymns contain".

22. Carmen Christi, London, 1967, p. 19. Note also the discussion above, pp. 76f, and the following statement by A.B. Macdonald on the kenosis-passage of Phil. 2.6ff.: "We would have been spared much tribulation, if only our fathers had been in a position to see that a passage like the so-called 'Kenosis-passage'...was first composed in the mood and manner of an inspired poet, and, only in a very secondary degree, in that of a scientific theologian" (Christian Worship in the Primitive Church, Edinburgh, 1934, p. 118, n. 1).

Because of the presence of theological words being used generally with reference to Jesus Christ, it is almost certain that there are 'overtones of meaning' in I.3.16b. But an effort must be made to distinguish between these possible 'overtones of meaning' which should not be assumed, and the essential 'basic meaning' of the words and phrases.

In conclusion our goal is, in the words of K. Stendahl,²³

"to describe, to relive and relate, in the terms and presuppositions of the period of the texts, what they meant to their authors and their contemporaries".

It is true that there are many problems involved in this undertaking, some of which will remain unresolved. Absolute certainty is admittedly impossible. Moreover, the following analysis will not be exhaustive since some of the words in themselves could be the subject of a separate thesis. But an attempt must be made to ascertain the meaning of the words and phrases in I.3.16b, tempered by the above philological considerations; and the conclusions of this thesis will largely rest on these findings, inadequate though they may be.

B. The Basic Analysis.

1. Ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἑδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι:

The parallelism of these two lines, i and ii, has long since been recognized, as the formal analysis above has indicated.²⁴ Nevertheless, many scholars continue to interpret them separately in their analyses. This is a puzzling methodology, for it places the interpreter immediately at a dis-

23. "Implications of Form-Criticism and Tradition-Criticism for Biblical Interpretation", JBL, 77 (1958), p. 38.

24. Supra, pp. 27ff.

advantage. For each line, by itself, is quite ambiguous for reasons already explained in the introduction: the hymnic factor, the conciseness of the lines, the diversity of the historical usage of the words and their possible 'overtones of meaning'.²⁵ Moreover, there are good reasons why an attempt should be made to interpret the two lines together. First, a larger context is necessary. The clauses are so short and problematic that they relate more to a lexical unit than to Barr's 'sentence'. Second, the antithetical parallelism of οὐδέ and πνεῦμα should not force the two lines away from each other, but should compel them to be drawn together in interpretation in an attempt to see why they have been contrasted with each other. Third, the verb ἐδικαίωθη suggests that there is a continuity of thought between lines i and ii. Fourth, this would be consistent with the conclusion of the analysis of form (Chap. I), that I.3.16b is patterned according to a 3x2 structure characterized by chiastic antithetical parallelism. Such a procedure would, therefore, be following the lead of the author's careful arrangement of the lines. Hence, lines i and ii will be considered together in the hope of more readily ascertaining their meaning.²⁶

However, in order to interpret lines i and ii together, first it will be necessary to discuss the numerous questions

25. *Supra*, pp. 74ff.

26. The interpretation of lines i and ii is an important key for the correct interpretation of the rest of the form. Thus, the analysis of these two lines will far exceed in length and in depth of discussion the following two pairs.

which have been raised with reference to each line and word. Note the outline of the following discussion:

- a. Past interpretations of line i.
- b. The basic interpretation of line i.
- c. The interpretation of line ii.
 - 1) An analysis of ἐδικαιώθη.
 - 2) An analysis of ἐν πνεύματι.
- d. Concluding analysis of lines i and ii.

In following this procedure, it is hoped that some agreement may be reached concerning the meaning of these two important lines.

- a. Past interpretations of line i:

The linguistic analysis of lines i and ii needs to include a critical survey of the former interpretations of line i. Because of the use of the aorist tense (ἐφανερώθη), various attempts have been made to identify this line with some particular event in the life of Jesus. Traditionally, it has been regarded as referring to his birth. Support for this interpretation is based on a comparative analysis of other texts which employ the same terms. Thus it is found that σάρξ, used to describe the humanity of Jesus, often implies the event of his birth as well.²⁷ In the semi-confessional text of Rom. 1.3 - "who was descended from David according to the flesh" - reference to his birth is incontestable. In Rom. 8.3, the verb πέμψας emphasizes his

27. In Jn. 1.14; Rom. 1.3; 8.3; 9.5; I Jn. 4.2 and II Jn. 7, the incarnation is prominent in their interpretation. However, in other texts - Jn. 6.51ff.; Acts 2.31; Eph. 2.14; Col. 1.22; Heb. 5.7; 10.20; I Pet. 3.18; 4.1 - if the incarnation is implied at all, it is only as the means whereby the all-important redemptive death is effected.

coming "in the likeness of sinful 'flesh'". Likewise, in John 1.14, ἐγένετο bears definite connotations as to his birth.²⁸ Moreover, the verb φανερώ is used elsewhere in the New Testament for Jesus' earthly appearance, especially as it is contrasted to the former 'hiddenness' of the mystery of God.²⁹ Logically speaking, the transitional event effecting the "once hidden...now revealed" sequence would be the birth of Jesus. In view of these parallels, this interpretation is not to be regarded lightly.³⁰

Nevertheless, D.M. Stanley finds it difficult to accept this view because σάρξ, when used with reference to Christ, signifies (for Stanley) "human nature in its weakness, creatureliness, sinfulness by which it is contrasted with the divine".³¹ Therefore, since σάρξ is in contrast to πνεῦμα in line ii which refers to Christ's resurrection, line i must refer not to his birth but to his crucifixion. Moreover he writes:³²

28. τίναμι is also the verb found in Rom. 1.3 (γενόμενον).

29. For relevant texts, cf. Rom. 3.21; 16.25f.; Col. 1.26; I Pet. 1.20; II Tim. 1.10; Tit. 1.2f.

30. Numerous scholars, present and past, have regarded line i as a reference to Jesus' birth. The following commentaries may be referred to as examples of this view: H. Alford, p. 315; J.N.D. Kelly, p. 90; C.K. Barrett, pp. 65f.; D. Guthrie, p. 89; W. Hendriksen, p. 140; E.K. Simpson, p. 61; C. Spicq, p. 109.

31. Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology, Rome, 1961, p. 237.

32. Ibid. Note the survey of Stanley's interpretation by R.H. Gundry, "The Form, Meaning and Background of the Hymn Quoted in I Timothy 3:16", Apostolic History and the Gospel, edd. W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin, Grand Rapids, 1970, p. 209f.; also n. 1. A.R.C. Leaney (The Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon (TBC), London, 1960, p. 61) also interprets line i in terms of the crucifixion.

"In the Pauline letters, Christ's σάφξ and its significance are described constantly in function of his redemptive death (Rom. 8.3; Col. 1.22; Eph. 2.14). The Pastoral epistles refer to the two comings of Christ, in a way peculiar to them, as two 'epiphanies' or manifestations: the first, a manifestation of God's 'saving favour' (Tit. 2.11), of his 'kindness' (Tit. 3.4); the second, a manifestation of 'glory' (Tit. 2.13). The first 'epiphany of our Saviour Christ Jesus' is said to have occurred by his 'having reduced death to impotence' (II Tim. 1.10), a clear reference to Christ's saving death. In view of all this, it seems more probable that our verse ought to be understood as an allusion to Christ's death in its redemptive character".

While this evidence is by no means convincing, it may be supplemented further by references outside the Pauline corpus. Note, for instance, the following texts where φανερώ is related to Jesus' redemptive death:

- Heb. 9.26b: "...he has appeared once for all...to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself..."
 I Jn. 3.5a: "You know that he appeared to take away sins..."
 8b: "...for this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil".

There are also references which show a connection between Jesus' σάφξ and his redemptive death (Jn. 6.51ff.; Heb. 2.14f.; 5.7; 10.20; I Pet. 3.18; 4.1).

A third view has been expressed by A. Descamps, J. Dupont and B. Schneider who regard line 1 as referring to Christ's post-resurrection appearances in corporeal form (ἐν σαρκί).³³ They view the whole form as "a paschal hymn treating exclusively of the glorified Christ, and so, this phrase as pointing rather to the manifestation of his flesh in glory after the resurrection".³⁴

33. A. Descamps, Les Justes et la justice, Louvain/Gembloux, 1950, pp. 84ff.; J. Dupont, ΣΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩ. L'union avec le Christ suivant saint Paul, Bruges, 1952, pp. 108f.; B. Schneider, "Κατὰ Πνεῦμα Ἀγιωσύνης", Biblica, 48 (1967) pp. 367, 384f.

34. B. Schneider, Op. Cit., p. 367.

In support of this view, there are four references in the gospels (Mk. 16. 12, 14; Jn. 21. 1f., 14) where φανερώνω is almost used as a terminus technicus for resurrection appearances.³⁵ The post-resurrection narrative of Lk. 24.39 may be viewed in this light: "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see that I have". J. Dupont enlists the following passages which he regards as referring to the resurrection:³⁶

- Titus 2.11: "For the grace of God has appeared (ἐπεφάνη)..."
 3.4 : "But when the goodness and loving kindness of God our Saviour appeared (ἐπεφάνη)..."
 II Tim. 1.9f.: "...his own purposes and grace...now has manifested (φανερωθεῖσιν) through the appearing (ἐπιφανείας) of our Saviour Christ Jesus, who abolished death...."

B. Schneider also finds a corroborative text in Acts 10.40: "but God raised him on the third day and made him manifest" (ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῶς γενέσθαι).³⁷

Thus, there are three different interpretations of line i, all of which assume that the use of the aorist tense (ἐφανερώθη) indicates some particular event in the life of Christ, and all of which claim the support of Scripture. In doing so, they demonstrate to some extent the diversity of usage of these terms in Scripture as well as the complexity

35. Three of the references (Mk. 16.12,14 and Jn. 21.14) are aorist indicative passive as in I.3.16b, and the fourth (Jn. 21.1) is aorist indicative active, with the reflexive pronoun.

36. Op. Cit., pp. 108ff. Cf. also A. Descamps, Op. Cit., pp. 84-89.

37. Op. Cit., p. 367. Note that a cognate of φανερώνω is used; i.e. ἐμφανής.

of attempting to identify line 1 with any one particular event. By following the criticisms of R.H. Gundry's recent article and supplementing them with further arguments, the above views may be discussed, turning first to the third point of Descamps, Dupont and Schneider.³⁸

The third view, in which line 1 is understood as referring to the glorious appearances of the risen Christ, has many difficulties. The following problems are recognized by Gundry:³⁹

"...support [for this view is taken] from Luke 24:39; Titus 2:11; 3:4; and especially 2 Timothy 1:10 where it is claimed that the first of Christ's two great appearances consists in the post-resurrection appearances (as a group), not the incarnation.⁴⁰ But the appearance of God's grace and kindness in Titus 2:11 and 3:4 is not tied specifically or exclusively to the resurrection of Jesus. And in 2 Timothy 1:9, 10 the clause "who abolished death" simply modifies "our Saviour Christ Jesus" without restricting to the resurrection his "appearing" by which God's purpose and grace" have been revealed. Only in Luke 24:39 is the resurrection mentioned in connexion with Christ's flesh (and bones), but there neither φανερώνω nor the similar ἐπιφαινῶ occurs so that the parallel is doubtful".

It may be noted further that Christ is not the subject of the verbs in II Tim. 1.9f., Tit. 2.11 and 3.4; but in each instance, the subject is an attribute (or two) of God.⁴¹ Also,

38. Gundry, Op. Cit., pp. 209f. This discussion is already partly in debt to Dr. Gundry in the survey above for the format and several ideas already acknowledged.

39. Ibid., p. 210.

40. None of the acknowledged commentaries on the Pastoral Epistles agree with this interpretation of II Tim. 1.10. For a general perspective, cf. E.F. Scott, Op. Cit., pp. 93f., 167f., 174; J.N.D. Kelly, Op. Cit., pp. 163, 244, 250f.

41. II Tim. 1.9f. - θεοῦ ... ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν καὶ χάριν ... φανερωθεῖσαν ...; Tit. 2.11 - ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ; 3.4 - ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία ... τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ.

in the Titus references, the verbs are not inflectional forms of φανερώνω but of its cognate ἐπιφαίνω. These observations, together with the omission of reference to Jesus' flesh, suggest that no direct parallel exists between these texts and line i.

Furthermore, one must question J. Dupont's view that I.3.16b is a paschal hymn celebrating 'exclusively' the glorified Christ.⁴² This interpretation, of course, assumes the Lucan view (as it is found in Acts) which finds a contrast between the resurrection appearances on earth and the glorified Lord. But it describes only his 'exalted' existence on earth, not his 'lowly' existence. In this case, lines i and ii would contain the only σάρξ/πνεῦμα contrast in the New Testament which does not carry with it some sense of the contrast of humiliation/exaltation. It would be antipodal to Rom. 1. 3-4 and I Pet. 3.18de in which σάρξ refers primarily (if not solely) to Christ's earthly existence. Since line i refers only to Jesus' post-resurrection experience, ἐδικαιώθη (l. ii) would necessarily imply some judgment not mentioned in the present six lines.⁴³ But Dupont does not take into consideration these implications of his view. Nor does he consider the numerous passages in which φανερώνω relates to the birth, life and redemptive death of Christ; and he dismisses the Johannine references to Christ's glorified earthly ministry as unique.⁴⁴

42. Op. Cit., pp. 108f.

43. Infra, pp. 115ff., 142f.

44. Note the view of W. Hendriksen (A Commentary on I and II Timothy and Titus, London, 1964, p. 139), who considers the thought throughout the hymn "that of glory and adoration. To be sure, the word 'flesh' in line i indicates

However, having listed the difficulties, the texts which support this view should not be overlooked. There are the four references in the gospels where φανερώνω refers exclusively to his resurrection appearances.⁴⁵ Moreover, B. Schneider's reference to Acts 10.40 is valid, even though a cognate form of φανερώνω is used.⁴⁶ The progression of thought and the implications of 'flesh' in the context suggest a parallel:

Acts 10.39-41: "(Christ)...They put him to death...but God raised him on the third day and made him manifest...to us...as witnesses, who ate and drank with him after he rose..."

Nevertheless, to the present writer's mind, this evidence is not sufficient to support Dupont's view that line 1 refers 'exclusively' to Christ's post-resurrection, glorified appearances.

Concerning the view held by D.M. Stanley that line 1 refers to his crucifixion, R.H. Gundry writes:⁴⁷

"It is true that Paul connects the σάρξ and death of Christ in Colossians 1:22 and (Eph.) 2.14 (but not Rom. 8:3, where God's sending his son in the likeness of sinful flesh is more general).⁴⁸ However, the

Contd.] Christ's 'humiliation'; but the expression 'manifested in the flesh' ('veiled in flesh the Godhead see') points to his exalted, glorious nature". On p. 140 he writes: "Hence, this voluntary self-concealment was at the same time a self-revelation. From the very beginning of his coming into the 'flesh' self-concealment and self-disclosure walked side by side..." From a different point of view, B.S. Easton (The Pastoral Epistles, London, 1948, p. 136) also recognizes that line 1 declares that Christ's life was "a theophany", though "only the eye of faith could see Christ's glory".

45. Mk. 16. 12, 14; Jn. 21. 1f., 14. Supra, p. 91.

46. Op. Cit., p. 367. The cognate form is ἐμφανής.

47. Op. Cit., pp. 209f.

48. In a footnote, Gundry (Ibid., p. 209, n. 1) makes the observation: "R.P. Martin's argument against Stanley that the hymnic quotation presents the baptizand with his

references cited by Stanley show that the connexion between Christ's σάρξ and death is incidental to the incarnation as a whole. And Stanley's argument from the sinfulness of σάρξ would work equally against his own view that line 1 refers to Jesus' death (see 2 Cor. 5:21: 'who knew no sin'). That view would seem to require 'suffered', 'crucified', or 'put to death', as in I Peter 3:18. Anyway, σάρξ does not always or even usually carry the connotation of sinfulness".

We cannot altogether agree with Gundry's criticism of Stanley's interpretation. One would have thought that the crowning point of the incarnation of Christ in the New Testament is his redemptive death; and the texts Stanley uses (Rom. 8.3; Col. 1.22; Eph. 2.14) would support this view. In Rom. 8.3, though more than the death of Christ is undoubtedly implied, the reference to 'flesh' is not complete apart from the ensuing statement (vv. 3b-4a):

"God...sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin,...condemned sin in the flesh, in order that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us..."

Thus, to the present writer's mind, L. Cerfaux correctly states: "Christ took a sinful body...which was essentially devoted to acting out the drama of his death".⁴⁹ Moreover,

Contd.] liberation from the hostile cosmic powers through Christ's victory rather than with Christ's death and resurrection takes for granted the very point at issue. After all, Jesus' death and resurrection have some relationship to baptism and the defeat of hostile powers..." Cf. R.P. Martin, "Aspects of Worship", Vox Evangelica, II, London, 1963, p. 26. In the same footnote, he properly dismisses as of little value the parallel texts (Lk. 24.26, 46; Jn. 3.14; 8.28; 12.32, 34; Rom. 6.7; Phil. 2.8-11; Col. 2.15) cited by A.R.C. Leaney (Op. Cit., p. 61).

49. Op. Cit., p. 281. "The key to this difficult clause (κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί) is supplied by ch. vi. 7-10 (Rom.). By the Death of Christ upon the Cross, a death endured in His human nature, he once and for ever broke off all contact with sin, which could only touch him through that nature" (W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans (ICC), Edinburgh, 1945, p. 193).

[Contd.]

in all three references, neither the incarnation or redemptive death is 'incidental' to the other. But if there is any priority of emphasis in these verses, the 'flesh' is presented as the means by which Christ was able to effect our reconciliation to God "through the cross" (Eph. 2.14); so also, Col. 1.22: "...he has now reconciled (you) in his body of flesh by his death..."⁵⁰

A more pertinent observation would be that Christ's redemptive death is never explicitly referred to as a 'manifestation'. His coming in flesh was a manifestation,⁵¹ and his resurrection appearances were manifestations,⁵² but not his death. Rather, he was manifested in order to die. The manifestation is basically the means of his redemptive death.⁵³ Several texts come close to saying that his death was a manifestation (Heb. 9.26; I Pet. 1.19f.), including those listed

Contd.] Concerning this difficult verse, E. Best (The Letter of Paul to the Romans (CBC), Cambridge, 1967, pp. 88f.) writes: "On the one hand Paul wishes to say that in every respect Jesus, God's Son, resembled us with the same lower nature that we have; yet he does not wish to say that he lived 'on the level of our lower nature' (which is often the connotation of the word 'flesh' in Romans)....Sin exercises its power through the lower nature (7:14-25), and it is there that it must be defeated...The crucial moment in the battle against sin was the death of Jesus (a sacrifice)...For it is in the death of Jesus that his lower nature is seen to have been completely real; the one event which is shared by all who have the lower nature is death, and Jesus was not a divine being who put on the disguise of a lower nature which he could drop at the terrifying moment of death..."

50. Cf. I Pet. 3.18.

51. Supra, p. 89, n. 29; infra, p. 98.

52. Mk. 16. 12, 14; Jn. 21.1f., 14. Supra, p. 91.

53. Cf. I Jn. 3.5, 8. Note also Heb. 9.26b, which may be properly translated: "he has appeared once for all at the consummation of the ages for (εις + acc. - with a view to) annulling (the abrogation) of sins through (διὰ + gen.) the sacrifice of himself". However, some may wish to

[Contd.]

by Stanley (Tit. 2.11; 3.4; II Tim. 1.9f.).⁵⁴ Moreover, there are references in the New Testament which like I Pet. 3.18de speak of Christ's 'death' in the flesh, thereby

Contd.] limit 'once for all' as a reference to 'the sacrifice of himself', in which case his death would be referred to as a manifestation.

54. Note that all three texts used by Stanley were used by J. Dupont as referring to Christ's resurrection appearances (see above, p. 91, and the criticism of Dupont's use of these texts on pp. 92f). Obviously, a certain ambiguity is present in all five texts if approached with the purpose of finding a specific event, with which to interpret Christ's 'manifestation'. Various reasons may be given as to why the early Church was not more specific in this regard. Perhaps they did not want to focus on the event of manifestation in the past, but on the salvation of the present. Perhaps the mention of his 'manifestation' brought to mind universally in the early Church a specific event which one is not able clearly to view today due to the inability to penetrate deeply enough into the teaching of the early Church. Perhaps it is due to the interrelation of birth-life-death-resurrection in the mind of the Church and their desire to view his 'manifestation' as a whole. Perhaps it is a combination of the above reasons.

The following problems should also be noted. Most commentators suggest that in Tit. 2.11 and 3.4, the manifestations refer 'generally' to the entire ministry and death of Christ. However, there is the further viewpoint seldom expressed that both 'manifestations' may point to the experience of the believer and not to the appearance of Christ in history. Several reasons may be given for this: 1) the use of ἐφανερώσεν in Tit. 1.3 (introductory to the letter and a difficult passage since the verb introduces an anacoluthon, the subject probably being "his word in the preaching"); 2) the background of Christian baptism in Tit. 3.4ff; 3) reference to the Christian life suggestive of baptism as well in Tit. 2.11ff.; 4) the use of a cognate form (ἐπιφαίνω); 5) Christ is not the explicit subject.

In Heb. 9.26 and I Pet. 1.19-20, the close relation of Christ's manifestation and his redemptive death bring into focus the problem involved. The reason one may interpret the manifestation of these passages as the means by which his death took place (and not the manifestation as his redemptive death) is that parallel passages such as I Jn. 3.5, 8 make this distinction, and also his manifestation elsewhere takes on a broader spectrum.

suggesting a parallel with line 1.⁵⁵ But in relation to his redemptive death, Christ's 'manifestation' regularly appears to represent a preliminary element in the gospel.

The traditional view, that line 1 refers to Jesus' birth, has fewer problems than the two examined above. But R.H. Gundry finds it difficult to restrict line 1 to this single event:⁵⁶

"...Further support [for reference to Jesus' birth] comes from the use of φανερώω elsewhere for the incarnate ministry of Jesus (Jn. 1.31; Heb. 9.26; I Pet. 1.20; I Jn. 1.2; 3.5,8) and from the use of σάρξ elsewhere for the humanity of Jesus (Jn. 1.14; 6.51ff.; Rom. 8.3; 9.5; Eph. 2.14; Col. 1.22; Heb. 5.7; 10.20; I Pet. 3.18; 4.1; I Jn. 4.2; II Jn. 7; cf. Lk. 24.39), not to delineate the very common uses of 'flesh' for humanity in general and for human life on this earth. In view of several considerations, 'manifested in flesh' probably refers to the entire earthly career of Jesus right up to the ascension, not to his birth alone: (1) the use of σάρξ for human lifetime (Gal. 2.20; Phil. 1.22,24; and especially Heb. 5.7, 'in the days of his flesh'); (2) the generality of the verb 'manifested', as opposed to a more specific verb (say, 'born'); and (3) the synthetic relationship to 'taken up in glory' (line 6). Ἐφανερώθη then becomes a constative aorist".

The fact that φανερώω is not used in Rom. 1.3, Jn. 1.14 or Rom. 8.3 to refer to Jesus' birth is important. Instead, the verbs (respectively) γενόμενον, ἐγένετο and πέμψας are used. The factor that relates all three verses to line 1 and to each other is the presence of the term σάρξ. Yet,

55. I Pet. 3.18d - put to death in the flesh; Rom. 8.3 - condemned sin in the flesh...; Eph. 2.14f. - having abolished in his flesh...; Col. 1.22 - ... reconciled in the body of his flesh...; Heb. 5.7 - In the days of his flesh, Jesus offered up prayers...; Heb. 10.20 - ... he opened...through the curtain...(i.e.) his flesh. Cf. also the contexts of Jn. 6.51ff. and Heb. 2.14f.

56. Op. Cit., p. 209.

while each denotes his birth, each may be shown to possess its own individual orientation. In Rom. 1.3 it is quite possible that the real emphasis is not on his humanity (flesh vs. spirit) but on his human lineage, not so much on his birth as on the background of his birth and its Messianic implications. However, in John 1.14 the author is trying to relate something of the mystery of the pre-existent Word taking on human flesh, God becoming man, and σάρξ probably connotes the entire span of Jesus' human existence.⁵⁷ In Rom. 8.3, σάρξ is qualified (πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί...) to show its direct significance as to the purpose of his coming - his redemptive death.⁵⁸ Thus, one is hesitant to restrict line 1 to his birth just on the evidence of these three verses.

Furthermore, there is not a single reference in the New Testament where φανερώω may be said to refer exclusively to Jesus' birth, even though the term is almost always used (when in reference to him) in the aorist tense. To suggest that ἐφανερώθη refers to Jesus' birth because it is logically the transitional event effecting the "once hidden...now revealed" sequence is to miss the wood for the trees. The stress is on his 'revelation' in flesh, and not on an event which at that time attracted only the attention of Herod,

57. Cf. J.N. Sanders and B.A. Martin, The Gospel According to St. John (BNTC), London, 1968, pp. 79ff.; E.C. Hoskyns and F.N. Davey, The Fourth Gospel, I, London, pp. 143f.; J.H. Bernard, Gospel According to St. John (ICC), I, Edinburgh, 1928, p. 20.

58. Supra, pp. 95f. and n. 49.

the wise men and a few shepherds. While his birth may be retained as part of the manifestation, John makes it clear that Jesus' real manifestation came in his ministry (Jn. 1.31; 2.11; 3.21; 7.4; I Jn. 1.2), death (I Jn. 3.5, 8) and resurrection (Jn. 21.1f., 14; perhaps I Jn. 1.2).⁵⁹ Moreover, there are the numerous other verbal parallels mentioned above with reference to his redemptive death and resurrection, not to mention the use of φανερώω with reference to his second coming,⁶⁰ the more general implications of his earthly ministry,⁶¹ and the manifestation which has taken place through proclamation since Christ's exaltation.⁶²

Therefore, R.H. Gundry seems to be correct when he suggests that line 1 is not necessarily restricted to Christ's birth. But should his further view be accepted - i.e. that ἐφανερώθη is a "constative aorist" referring to the "entire earthly career of Jesus right up to the ascension"?⁶³

Gundry's interpretation stands in contrast to all three of the views just examined which assume that in I.3.16b the aorist tense could only refer back to a single event in past time. His argument challenging this position has already been quoted above (p. 98) in which he makes three points. His first point is that σάπξ may be used for 'human lifetime',

59. Supra, p. 98, n. 44. W. Lock (The Pastoral Epistles [ICC], Edinburgh, 1924, p. 45) writes: "Of the human life, as an unveiling of a previous existence, and perhaps including the manifestation after the Resurrection..."

60. Col. 3.4a; I Pet. 5.4; I Jn. 2.28; 3.2b.

61. See the quotation by R.H. Gundry, supra, p. 98.

62. Rom. 16.25f.; Col. 1.26-8; Tit. 1.3.

63. Op. Cit., p. 209.

as it is in Gal. 2.20; Phil. 1.22, 24 and especially Heb. 5.7 which refers to the lifetime of Jesus. But this argument by itself is not strong. Obviously, σάρξ remains with every human being throughout his mortal existence. But extension of time is indicated in general not by the term σάρξ, but by the context in which σάρξ occurs.

Gundry's second point is that φανερώνω is basically a general verb used elsewhere for 'the incarnate ministry of Jesus'.⁶⁴ Thus, it contrasts with the more specific verbs such as γίνομαι (Rom. 1.3) and θανατώνω (I Pet. 3.18) or ἀποθνήσκω (I Cor. 15.3) which are used in other Christological formulas, and which leave no doubt as to which event is meant. The difficulty of this view is that φανερώνω is used specifically in Mark 16.12, 14 and Jn. 21.1, 14 with reference to Jesus' resurrection appearances, and in Col. 3.4; I Jn. 2.28; 3.2 and I Pet. 5.4 with reference to his second coming. Otherwise, in the nineteen references which remain and which are used in the aorist tense, the context seems to refer to the life of Jesus in general and not to any specific event.⁶⁵

64. Ibid. Note the references given above in his quote, p. 98.

65. This is especially evident when φανερώνω is used in conjunction with the familiar temporal contrast between the promises of the past and their present fulfillment, e.g.: Rom. 16.25f.; Col. 1.26; II Tim. 1.9f; Tit. 1.2f.; I Pet. 1.20 and I Jn. 1.2. The remainder of the nineteen references are: Jn. 1.31; 2.11; 3.21; 9.3; 17.6; Rom. 1.19; II Cor. 4.11; I Jn. 1.2 (twice); 2.18f.; 3.5, 8; 4.9; Apoc. 15.4. Of these references, twelve occur in the Johannine literature. It has already been observed (p. 100) how John emphasizes that Jesus' real manifestation came in his ministry. Thus, E.K. Simpson feels led to make the comment (The Pastoral Epistles, London, 1954, p. 61): "φανερῶσθαι we know to be a favourite Johannine expression, descriptive of the historical reality of Christ's abode among us".

Furthermore, Gundry's argument concerning ἐφανερώθη may be supplemented through a comparison with the other five verbs in the form. It is significant that all six verbs are used in the aorist indicative passive form. But can the remaining five verbs be limited to denote a single occurrence of an action in past time? This may be possible in lines ii, iii and vi. But lines iv and v seem to represent not just one point of time in the past, but an extension of time from the beginning of the proclamation to that day of universal belief.⁶⁶ Therefore, line i is not the only line in which identification with a specific event in past history is fraught with problems.

Gundry's third point concerns what he describes as "the synthetic relationship [of line i] to 'taken up in glory' (line 6)".⁶⁷ Because of the brevity of his article, he does not enlarge on this point. But what he appears to have in mind is the supposition that line i is the complement of line vi; and since line vi (in his view) denotes 'accompanying circumstance' ('in the cloud of glory') rather than the act of ascending ('into glory'), line i must follow suit. There is some question concerning his interpretation of line vi, as will be seen below.⁶⁸ But the all-embracing character

66. Cf. W. Hendriksen (Op. Cit., p. 141), who refers line iv to the commission in Mt. 28.18-20, and line v to the same, being "the direct result of the pre-ascension mandate". But this is giving the lines a meaning they would not normally have. It could also be pointed out in line ii, that if the author wanted to refer to a specific event, he could have used such specific terms as ἐγείρω or ζωοποιέω which are found in other formulary statements.

67. Op. Cit., p. 209; supra, p. 98.

68. Infra, pp. 166f.

of line vi - which not only incorporates the ascension but his entire enthronement as Lord since that point of time - would suggest that line i should not be limited to any specific event such as his birth.⁶⁹

Thus, it is possible that Gundry is correct in regarding ἐφανερώθη as a 'constative' aorist, viewing the entire "earthly career of the incarnate Christ".⁷⁰ Evidence for this view consists 1) of the inadequacy of those interpretations which attempt to identify line i with a single event in the life of Jesus, 2) of the frequency with which φανερόω in the aorist tense is used generally of the life of Jesus without reference to any specific event, and 3) of the use of the aorist passive in the following five lines.⁷¹

But the author of I.3.16b may be trying to convey even more than this. It may be his purpose in line i to stress

69. For this interpretation of line vi, infra, sec. II.B.3.

70. Op. Cit., p. 210. Note W. Stenger (Op. Cit., p. 38), who writes: "Der Kursvers [line i] hat damit die Bedeutung: Er wurde offenbar gemacht im irdischen Bereich des Fleisches, und meint ganz allgemein das Christusereignis in der Welt, ohne eine bestimmte Seite dieses Christusereignisses besonders herauszustellen". Also H. Zimmermann (Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre, Stuttgart, 1968, p. 210): "das ganze irdische Leben Christi".

Concerning the 'constative' aorist, N. Turner (Op. Cit., p. 72) writes: "Constative (summary) or Complexive aorist conceives the idea as a whole without reference to the beginning, progress, or end; it is a total yet punctiliar aspect...The action is represented as complete...". To view an extension of time as a whole, in past time, is not difficult. But to suggest that this action is both 'constative' and 'punctiliar' at the same time seems self-contradictory. For this reason, the alternative designation - 'complexive' - will be preferred in this thesis.

71. Infra, pp. 274ff.

the soteriological significance of the coming of Jesus, viz. he was the revelation of God in our sphere of existence. In this case, line i would not be emphasizing any one particular event, nor 'directly' the entire life of Jesus (with Gundry), but that the 'pre-existent One' was revealed in human form. If this is the purpose of the author, then ἐφανερώθη may be thought of as a "'Perfective' (or effective, or resultative) aorist..., in which the emphasis is all on the conclusion or results of an action".⁷² Would this mean that ἐφανερώθη is not a 'complexive' aorist? It may be that the verb includes both ideas, with the emphasis primarily on the 'consequences' of the whole life of Jesus.⁷³

b. The basic interpretation of line i:

In the foregoing discussion, the various current interpretations of line i were analyzed. Before going on to consider the full scope of its meaning in relation to line ii, it is important to determine what nuances are fundamental and indispensable in an interpretation of line i.

The elements in this expression are common to the writers of the New Testament, especially to John and Paul; but their combination in this explicit form is unique. The main thought seems to be that Christ "appeared on earth as a real man".⁷⁴ Thus, on the one hand, the expression states that

72. J.H. Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. III, "Syntax", by N. Turner, Edinburgh, 1963, p. 72.

73. Infra, pp. 274ff. For the term 'complexive', supra, n. 70.

74. J.N.D. Kelly, Op. Cit., p. 90.

what was not visible became visible; on the other hand, it states that he was "in the fullest sense real and human, being composed of flesh".⁷⁵

But is it possible, without the help of line ii, to broaden further this interpretation of ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί? The verb ἐφανερώω means "to reveal, make known, show".⁷⁶ It contrasts with that which formerly was hidden or unknown; as W. Lock observes, it denotes the "unveiling of a previous existence".⁷⁷ But not all scholars accept that this nuance is present in the line. M. Dibelius thinks that there is no direct evidence for pre-existence here.⁷⁸ W. Stenger agrees:⁷⁹

"Man darf diese Aussage nicht von vornherein auf die Inkarnation beziehen und auch nicht aus der Bedeutung des Verbums weiterfolgernd darauf schließen, daß hier an Präexistenz gedacht sei, weil ja nur offenbar werden könne, was vorher schon existiert habe, sondern man hat mit der besonderen Art hymnischen Sprechens zu rechnen, das ja nicht logisch deduzierend, sondern preisend, bekenkend die Wirklichkeit aussagt."

Nevertheless, most scholars agree that 'pre-existence' is

75. C.K. Barrett, The Pastoral Epistles (NCBS), Oxford, 1963, p. 65. Cf. Col. 1.22; Heb. 2.14; 5.7; 10.20; I Pet. 3.18; 4.1. R. Bultmann (Theology of the New Testament, II, trans. K. Grobel, London, 1968, p. 123) writes: "The humanity of Christ - the fact, that is, that the saving event took place in the sphere of the 'flesh' - is essential", and he refers in this regard to I.3.16b.

76. W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, Grand Rapids, 1957, p. 860.

77. Op. Cit., p. 45. Cf. A. Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, London, 1958, pp. 54, 59f.

78. Op. Cit., 1955, p. 50.

79. Op. Cit., p. 36.

implied in the phrase 'manifested in flesh'.⁸⁰ Although the emphasis of this phrase is on his appearance and not on his pre-existence, the latter nuance would serve to underscore the nature of his appearance as the 'Revelation' of God, One who in essence was divine. In other words, ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί would have suggested to the singers of the hymn the godward dimension of Jesus' humanity, i.e. that his ministry on earth could only be grasped and understood in the divine dimension.⁸¹

The nature of Jesus' visible appearance (or 'epiphany') is indicated by the phrase - ἐν σαρκί. E. Schweizer suggests:⁸² "die irdische Existenz als solche schon Gegenstand des Glaubensbekenntnisses ist." Whether this indicates a reaction against a gnostic-type influence and a later date of composition for the form remains to be seen. But it does stress that Jesus belonged to the terrestrial world, the

80. Cf. R.H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology, London/Glasgow, 1969, p. 217; also the commentaries by the following scholars: N. Borx (p. 160); D. Guthrie (p. 89); C.K. Barrett (p. 65); E.F. Scott (p. 41); E.K. Simpson (p. 61); B.S. Easton (p. 136); et al. J.N.D. Kelly (Op. Cit., p. 90) is a little more hesitant: "...pre-existence is probably, though not necessarily, implied".

81. That the early Christians would have identified line 1 with Jesus whom they worshipped as the One come from the Father is suggested by Pliny (Ep. X. 97), who wrote that the Christians of Bithynia sang hymns to Christ as to a god. We find the same nuances in other NT Christ-hymns; esp. Col. 1.15ff.; Phil. 2.6ff.; Heb. 1.1ff. and Jn. 1.1ff. As R.P. Martin ("Aspects of Worship", p. 26) observes: "First, His pre-existence and pre-temporal activity are made the frontispiece of the hymns, and, from the divine order in which He eternally is He 'comes down' as the Incarnate One in an epiphany..."

82. Erniedrigung und Erhöhung, Zürich, 1962, p. 104.

realm of the earthly and natural, of the purely human; as R. Jewett writes:⁸³

"Σάρξ (as a 'psychological category')...refers to the strictly human realm of the concrete flesh, its sensual desires and its capabilities. This realm is morally neutral as long as one merely lives within it (ἐν σαρκί)".

Hence, if there are connotations of glory present in the nuance of pre-existence (ἐνανθρωπήσας), they are quickly balanced by the lowliness of his form (ἐν σαρκί). In the world of the Old and New Testaments, man is flesh in contrast to God who is Spirit; and to speak of flesh is to speak of the frailty of the creature.⁸⁴ It was into this realm of human existence that Jesus came and appeared.⁸⁵ In this sense, ἐν is used as a locative.

But ἐν σαρκί should not be limited to this locative sense of the general realm of human existence in which he appeared. The phrase also relates specifically to Jesus' particular life on earth. Jesus expressed himself through flesh which was his own body.⁸⁶ These more personal nuances

83. Paul's Anthropological Terms, Leiden, 1971, p. 115. J.A.T. Robinson (Op. Cit., pp. 17f.) supposes that σάρξ connotes "the whole person, considered from the point of view of his external, physical existence". Of course, σάρξ is not always used as a 'psychological category', as Jewett (Op. Cit., pp. 115f) clearly demonstrates. But note the following references which relate σάρξ to Jesus, most of which must be considered 'neutral' in meaning: Rom. 1.3; 8.3; 9.5; Eph. 2.14; Col. 1.22; Jn. 1.14; I Jn. 4.2; II Jn. 7; Acts 2.31; Heb. 2.14f.; 5.7; 10.20; I Pet. 3.18; 4.1.

84. Cf. esp. Isa. 31.3 and 40.6f. Note the article on "Flesh" by G. Chapman, Dictionary of Biblical Theology, ed. X. Léon-Dufour, London, 1967, pp. 160ff.

85. G. Holtz (Die Pastoralbriefe, Berlin, 1965, p. 90): "In die endliche, niedrige Welt der σάρξ kam Christus (vgl. Jn. 1.14)".

86. Note R.H. Gundry's arguments in this regard (Op. Cit., pp. 210f.).

are found throughout the form, right beside the somewhat abstract categories of 'spheres of existence'.⁸⁷

Having determined what is fundamental and indispensable to any interpretation of line i, line ii may now be brought into consideration. What is the meaning of line ii, and what does either of the lines contribute to the interpretation of the other?

C. The interpretation of line ii:

As in line i, both δικαίω and πνεῦμα are common to Paul and the other New Testament writers and are used in a multiplicity of ways; but their combination here is unique. Consequently, numerous interpretations have been given of which the following are representative:

- i - "By 'spirit' he here means the inmost being of Christ - his heart, his soul, the spring of all his motives and desires; even in this realm he was shown or declared or proved to be just and sinless and faultless and perfect".
- ii - "The Holy Spirit was the grand vindication of the Son of God at His baptism, in His miracle working, in the casting out of demons, at Pentecost, and in the conviction and conversion of sinners".
- iii - "At the end of his earthly existence, he was vindicated when God raised him up after the death he had voluntarily endured. This was done 'in the spirit' not in that his flesh was not raised, but in that it was the Spirit (of God), not flesh in itself, which was capable of effecting resurrection".
- iv - "...he was 'vindicated', i.e. declared righteous and shown to be in fact Son of God, in respect of his spiritual nature, a reference to the resurrection being implied".
- v - "Darnach bezieht sich also δικαιοῦσθαι nicht auf die Sündenvergebung, sondern auf das Eingehen in die göttliche Sphäre, die Sphäre der δικαιοσύνη über die Geisterwelt dargestellt wurde, ist zu Phil. 2.9f., Col. 2.15 gezeigt worden".⁸⁸

87. Note esp. line iii, where there is no ἐν preceding ἀρχαῖς.

88. i - C.R. Erdman, The Pastoral Epistles of Paul, Philadelphia, 1923, p.47. Erdman continues: "The first line speaks of his real humanity, the second of his complete holiness; the former of his actual manhood, the latter of his spiritual perfection". W. Lock (Op. Cit., p. 45) acknowledges this as one of the possible interpretations, though
[Contd.]

Contd.] he spells 'spirit' with a capital 'S': "'was made righteous in the spiritual sphere', (i.e.) was kept sinless through the action of the Spirit upon His Spirit". For an excellent summary of this view, see A. Plummer, The Pastoral Epistles, London, 1894, pp. 136-7; also J.P. Lilley, The Pastoral Epistles, Edinburgh, 1901, pp. 110f.

ii - J.B. Rowell, "The Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ Vindicated", Bibliotheca Sacra, 114 (1, 1957), p. 74. Rowell would combine this interpretation as well with those of i and iii: "It was 'through the eternal Spirit' that 'he offered himself without spot to God' (Heb. 9.14) ...it was His literal resurrection from the dead which justified His claims to deity..." A.E. Hillard (The Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul, London, 1919, p. 36) writes: "He was justified in the presence of the power of the Spirit in all that he claimed, did, and taught". E.K. Simpson (Op. Cit., p. 61) also acknowledges the possibility of this connotation when he writes: "The Redeemer's profound claims are vindicated on the basis of his deity...his miracles are outflashings of the hidden Godhead". Cf. Mt. 12.18, 28; Lk. 4.18f.; Acts 10.38. R. Falconer (The Pastoral Epistles, Oxford, 1937, p. 138) also cites Lk. 3.22; 9.35; 10.21-4; Jn. 16.14.

iii - C.K. Barrett, Op. Cit., p. 65. This interpretation focuses on the event of Christ's resurrection as the vindication of his suffering and death as a felon. While it is commonly thought that line ii includes reference to his resurrection, not all would accept that lines i and ii are a contrast between his death and resurrected life. However, note the following commentators: J. Jeremias, Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus (NTD), Göttingen, 1953, pp. 2102; B. Weiss, Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus, Göttingen, 1902, p. 157; D.M. Stanley, Christ's Resurrection, pp. 237f.; J. Parry, The Pastoral Epistles, Cambridge, 1920, p. 22 and E.K. Simpson, Op. Cit., pp. 61f. A.R.C. Leaney (Op. Cit., p. 61) writes: "In the flesh Jesus was humiliated, crucified. In the Spirit the same events have a different aspect". W. Hendriksen (Op. Cit., p. 140) combines this interpretation with i above in the following manner: "...by the Spirit he was vindicated: his own perfect righteousness and the validity of his claims were fully established...By means of every deed of power his justice was established, for surely the Holy Spirit would not have given this power to a sinner (Jn. 9.31). But it was especially by means of his resurrection from the dead that the Spirit fully vindicated the claim of Jesus that he was the Son of God (Rom. 1:4)". However, it is preferable to view ἐν πνεύματι as a locative referring to the general realm of spirit rather than as an instrumental dative referring to the Holy Spirit (*infra*, pp. 129ff.). For this reason, R.H. Gundry (Op. Cit., p. 212) finds in line ii a reference to the resurrection "not by the operation of the Holy Spirit, but in the realm of spirit with reference to the spiritual nature of Christ's glorified body".

[Contd.]

Moreover, many scholars combine two or more of these interpretations as may be seen in footnote 88. There is little doubt that this is the most difficult line of I.3.16b to interpret. Nevertheless, some insights may first be reached by considering each of the words - δικαιώ and πνεύμα - separately.

Contd.]

iv - J.N.D. Kelly, Op. Cit., p. 90. The emphasis here lies on the exoneration of Jesus' character and the vindication of his deity. While his manifestation was limited in the flesh, the true character of his being was revealed in the spiritual sphere. Cf. D. Guthrie, The Pastoral Epistles, London, 1967, pp. 89f.; K.S. Wuest, The Pastoral Epistles in the Greek New Testament, Grand Rapids, 1954, p. 64; H.A. Kent, The Pastoral Epistles, Chicago, 1958, 145f.; et al. For R.P. Martin ("Aspects of Worship", p. 25), line ii refers to "His being glorified by God as He entered...the spiritual sphere. G. Holtz (Op. Cit., p. 91) writes: "Nach Joh. 16, 10 offenbart der Hingang Jesu zum Vater die δικαιοσύνη, denn er wird im Prozeß im Himmel zum Sieger und für unschuldig erklärt...in diesem jüdisch-orientalischen Sprachgebrauch gehören Gerechtigkeit und Sieg zusammen". H. Zimmermann (Op. Cit., pp. 210f.) suggests that line ii refers not so much to any eschatological event as to the present work of the Holy Spirit who reveals that Jesus was and is the real Victor. E. Schweizer (Erniedrigung, pp. 63ff.; and Lordship, pp. 64ff.) also views line ii as a reference to Christ's vindication in the spiritual sphere of existence. He finds a parallel usage of δικαιώ in Rom. 3.4 (= Ps. 51.6), where δικαιωθῆς is placed parallel to νικᾷ. However, he combines this interpretation with the fifth interpretation which follows, and means 'divinized' (infra, pp. 118ff.).

v - M. Dibelius, Op. Cit., p. 50. Dibelius is here suggesting that line ii simply means "entrance into the godly sphere". It stands in contrast to interpretation iv in that it adds the Hellenistic meaning 'divinized'. He finds parallel usages in Ign. Phila. 8:2 (H. Schlier, Religionsgeschichtliche untersuchungen zu den Ignatius-briefen, Giessen, 1929, p. 171); Corpus Hermeticum 13.9; Odes of Solomon 17.2; 25.12; 29.5; 31.5. Note the discussion of his interpretation below, pp. 111ff.

1) An analysis of ἐδικαιώθη:

The lexicons give δικαιόω several nuances: i) to make (set) free or pure; ii) to show or do justice to someone; and iii) to acquit or to pronounce and treat as righteous.⁸⁹ But which nuance (or nuances) most properly reflects the sense of ἐδικαιώθη in line ii?

i) With reference to the first nuance listed, I Cor. 6.11 may be noted where ἐδικαιώθητε means "you have become pure". In line with this usage is that found by Reitzenstein in the mystery religions where δικαιοῦσθαι is used with reference to a radical inner change in which the initiate experiences a "new birth" and becomes "deified".⁹⁰ In this sense the term is used in the mystery of rebirth in the Corpus Hermeticum 13.9. In the light of this Hellenistic usage, M. Dibelius has suggested that ἐδικαιώθη in I.3.16b should affirm Christ's exaltation to the divine sphere of δικαιοσύνη. He argues on the one hand that line ii in no way corresponds to Paul's usage of δικαιόω with reference to justification by faith. On the other hand, there is the parallel found in Ignatius' letter to the Philadelphians 8.2 θέλω ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ ὑμῶν δικαιωθῆναι. In this latter reference, Dibelius regards δικαιόω as having the approximate

89. Cf. W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, Grand Rapids, 1963; J.H. Moulton and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, London, 1949; and H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, Oxford, 1940.

90. R. Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, Leipzig/Berlin, 1927, pp. 257f.

meaning of θεοῦ ἐπιτυχεῖν, a "specifically Ignatian expression meant to designate martyrdom as a direct way to God".⁹¹ He also regards ἐδικαιώθη in line ii as having some connection with the idea of greeting in the court of heaven (as in the myth of Horus), and links this with the thought of triumph over the spirit world hinted at in Phil. 2.9f. and Col. 2.15.⁹²

However, this interpretation is doubtful for several reasons. First, this Hellenistic sense of 'divinized' is absent from canonical and extra-Biblical evidence prior to the second century.⁹³ J.N.D. Kelly regards this absence of evidence as "not a serious problem, especially as the passage is a citation".⁹⁴ But since the citation stems from Christian tradition, it would be expected to have some parallel in the New Testament documents. Second, Dibelius' interpretation of δικαιωθῆναι in Ign. Phil. 8.2 may be questioned. Not only is it uncertain whether Ignatius was using the term in an eschatological-juridical sense meaning "to reach the presence of God", but it is also uncertain whether "Ignatius thought of attaining full discipleship, justification, and Jesus Christ at martyrdom in terms of divinization".⁹⁵ In

91. This quote is taken from W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich, Op. Cit., p. 197.

92. M. Dibelius, Op. Cit., p. 39f. With reference to this latter idea, Dibelius refers to the discussion of E. Norden (Die Geburt des Kindes, Darmstadt, 1969, p. 124) concerning the great song to Osiris.

93. J.N.D. Kelly, Op. Cit., p. 90.

94. Ibid.

95. R.H. Gundry, Op. Cit., p. 210, n. 2.

this light, Ign. Phil. 8.2 is not a reliable parallel. Finally, if the analysis of the basic interpretation of line i be accepted, the presence of 'pre-existence' in that line would discount any idea of divinization in line ii since the divine dimension of Jesus' humanity is already present. For these reasons, Dibelius' interpretation should be regarded as improbable.

ii) The second nuance listed - to show or do justice to someone - is generally accepted as the primary sense of δικαιώθη in line ii. However, the usage of פָּדָה and δικαιώω in former Hebrew and Greek literature reveals an important difference to be noted in their concepts of justice. C.H. Dodd's study shows how the Hebrew antecedent of δικαιώω (פָּדָה), even in its Hiphil (Causative) form (פָּדָה), does not mean 'to make righteous' or 'to declare righteous', but is used in a more favorable sense meaning 'to redress', 'to put a person in the right', thus implying more than just the neutral sense of 'to do a person justice'. God's acts of justice are also acts of mercy.⁹⁶

"The Hebrew conception of the function of the judge tends to be not so much to apply with strict impartiality an abstract principle of justice, but rather to come to the assistance of the injured person, and vindicate him".

He observes that the Greek reader would find something a little strange in this use of the term. For the popular Greek conception of righteousness was in line with the narrower sense - 'to do a person justice'; and in contrast to the favourable sense meaning 'to redress', it nearly always connoted the negative sense 'to condemn'.⁹⁷

96. The Bible and the Greeks, London, 1954, p. 47.

97. Ibid., p. 53; also pp. 42ff.

In his summary statement of the Greek usage of δικαιοσύνη, D. Hill observes:⁹⁸

"Throughout most of its development the Greek word δικαιοσύνη tended towards the more precise and narrow meaning of 'justice', the giving of what was due to each. Consequently there is nothing parallel to the semantic development of the Hebrew world towards 'deliverance' and 'assistance' and away from the idea of strict justice".

The reason for the continuation of this narrow, neutral sense in Greek thought is to be attributed, according to Hill, to the absence in Greek thought of anything comparable to the idea of the "righteousness of God", which is a righteousness bent on salvation having a bias towards 'assistance' and 'deliverance'.⁹⁹ In this regard, N.M. Watson observes concerning the function of the judge and the lawcourts in ancient Israel:¹⁰⁰

"Judgment was one of the functions of the king, and between the various kingly functions there was no clear-cut distinction made. Quite often, after deciding who was in the right and who was in the wrong in a particular case, the judge went on to reward the innocent and punish the guilty. Thus, as Skinner wrote half a century ago, the word 'righteousness' as applied to a judge denotes 'not merely the neutral impartial attitude of mind which decides fairly between rival interests'; it denotes rather 'a positive energy on the side of right'. The righteous judge was expected to take the side of the innocent party and see that all was well with him".

98. Op. Cit., p. 103.

99. Ibid., pp. 92ff., 103. T.W. Manson (On Paul and John, ed. M. Black [SBT, 38], London, 1967, p. 54) writes: "When we turn to the Septuagint we find that δικαίω is a technical term in judicial procedure. It means to give judgment in favour of a person; and it is impressed upon those who act in the courts of Israel that they should pronounce in favour of the person who is actually in the right". This idea of righteousness influenced the entire ethical pattern of the Hebrew nation, for Yahweh's kind of righteousness must be reflected in the judgments of His people: "As Yahweh is righteous,....so be ye righteous".

100. "Some Observations on the Use of δικαίω in the Septuagint", JBL 79 (3, 1960) p. 256.

This distinction between the narrower, neutral sense of 'to do a person justice' and the broader, soteriological sense of 'to redress' or 'to put a person in the right' is important to remember in the interpretation of ἐδικαιώθη in line ii. It is reasonable to suppose, in view of the character of Christ and in view of the fact that line ii seems to connote exaltation even apart from consideration of the verb (due to the contrasting parallelism of line ii with line i and the continuation of the exaltation theme in lines iii - vi), that ἐδικαιώθη is more in line with the Hebraic concept of righteousness than with the Greek. For the Hebraic would connote not only the neutral sense of justice, but also the positive action of putting the injured person in the right. Therefore, ἐδικαιώθη would convey the idea of God vindicating the person and work of Jesus Christ.

But this does not mean that there are no forensic connotations involved in I.3.16b.¹⁰¹ For if Christ "was vindicated", then an accusation is presupposed. R. Deichgräber identifies the accusation with that of his Jewish accusers: "...you, being a man, make yourself God". It is against this accusation that God comes to the assistance of his ma-igned Son vindicating him throughout his lifetime and especially through his resurrection.¹⁰²

T. Preiss thinks of ἐδικαιώθη in a more juridical setting. Jesus was condemned by the tribunal of the world.

101. By 'forensic', reference is being made to that which is characteristic of a law court or legal debate.

102. Gottes hymnus und Christushymnus, Göttingen, 1967, pp. 136f.

When he declared at his trial that they would see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of God and coming with the clouds of heaven, he was saying in effect that another trial will take place before God where he is the Judge and they the accused. Likewise, Stephen, condemned like his Master, sees heaven open and the Son of Man standing (as a witness) at the right hand of God. Both knew that at the very moment that they were condemned by men, they were justified by and in the presence of God.¹⁰³

Whether T. Preiss has gone too far in describing the forensic metaphor may be questioned. But there are good reasons for including a forensic nuance in the interpretation. It may be observed that other verbs such as δοκιμάζω ('accepted as proved' or 'approve'), (ἐν)δείκνυμι ('to show' or 'to prove'), or ὑψόω ('to exalt') could have been used to convey the idea of 'vindication'. But δικαίω was chosen which in the New Testament, as G. Schrenk observes, "almost always implies the forensic metaphor".¹⁰⁴ Moreover, a forensic nuance is common to the meaning and development of words expressing 'righteousness' in both the Greek and

103. Life in Christ, trans. H. Knight, London, 1954, p. 54. He observes the presence of the Son of Man motif in both references (Mt. 26.64//Mk. 14.62//Lk. 22.69; Acts 7.55f.), though he also notes a difference between the two scenes. For Jesus, the Son of Man is seated as Judge; for Stephen, the Son of Man is standing as a witness before God.

104. Righteousness, trans. J.R. Coates, London, 1951, p. 59. Concerning the use of δικαίω in the LXX, N.M. Watson (Op. Cit., p. 266) observes: "Our conclusion is that the LXX translators intended δικαίω to carry substantially the same range of meanings as that carried by צדק, and that, when they used the Greek verb, they did have the picture of a judge as clearly in their minds as did the authors of the Hebrew Bible when they used the Hebrew equivalent". So also, L. Morris, The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross, London, 1955, pp. 226f. Infra, n. 107.

Hebrew languages.¹⁰⁵ In this light, there would need to be good reason to exclude it from line 11.

Furthermore, the cognate form δίκαιος is used in the forensic setting of the trial and death of Jesus, conveying the idea of 'innocence'. In Matt. 27.19, the wife of Pilate advises her husband: μηδὲν σοὶ καὶ τῷ δίκαιῳ ἐκεῖνῳ; and Pilate himself concludes his courtroom hearing with the words: "I am innocent of the blood τοῦ δικαίου τούτου" (Matt. 27.24). In this context, δίκαιος conveys the idea of the legal guiltlessness of Jesus. Another interesting use of δίκαιος is found in Luke 23.47 where the centurion at the cross states: "Surely this man was δίκαιος". Preceding this reference in the same chapter of Luke, the innocence of Jesus is declared by Pilate (23.4, 14, 22), by Herod (23.15) and by the repentant thief (23.41). Thus, it may be supposed that δίκαιος in this context refers to the innocence of Jesus, especially in contrast to the accusations which had led to this miscarriage of justice.¹⁰⁶ These usages of δίκαιος in the forensic context of Jesus' trial and death provide an interesting parallel for I.3.16b and make it quite feasible that ἐδικαιώθη includes this forensic sense. In this light, ἐδικαιώθη could be used effectively to refer either to the verdict of innocence as "the Righteous One" through whom the justifying act of forgiveness on God's part was consummated, or to the verdict of divine Sonship which was not

105. Cf. D. Hill, Op. Cit., p. 102.
 106. Cf. D. Hill (Ibid., pp. 121ff.) for a full discussion of these verses.

in evidence during his lowly manifestation, or to both.

Hence, it is considered probable that ἐδικαιώθη not only includes a forensic sense but also conveys the Hebraic idea of 'redress' or 'putting a person in the right'. The former sense sets the word within the context of the lawcourt and legal debate, while the latter serves to emphasize the positive, soteriological benefits of such a proceeding.¹⁰⁷

E. Schweizer appears to combine these two senses in I.3.16b when he states that the idea "is that of a lawsuit between God and the world", and then adds that ἐδικαιώθη should be interpreted in terms of the Jewish idea of vindication. But he goes one step further and states that ἐδικαιώθη "simply means the entry into the divine sphere" (as in Dibelius).¹⁰⁸

R.P. Martin expresses the frustration of others when he writes:¹⁰⁹

"E. Schweizer interprets the meaning (of ἐδικαιώθη) in the light of Rom. iii.4 (=Ps. li.4) where it is parallel with νικᾶν (in the forensic sense of 'to win a verdict') ...But it is not easy to follow him when he goes on to declare that the verb in I Tim. iii.16 thus means 'eingehehen in die göttliche Sphäre'."

-
107. It cannot be denied that the question of the extent the forensic and/or soteriological senses are present in δικαίω and δικαιώω in the OT and LXX is still debated. Some scholars prefer to view the soteriological sense ('to save' or 'to set free') as the dominant meaning in these terms; notably, M.-J. Lagrange, Saint Paul: Épitre aux Romains, Paris, 1950, pp. 123ff.; N.H. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, London, 1944, pp. 166ff. For a comparison of the forensic and soteriological nuances in these terms, see N.M. Watson, Op. Cit.; D.E.H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul, Oxford, 1964; G. Schrenk, Op. Cit., esp. pp. 4f., 59ff.; and T.W. Manson, Op. Cit., pp. 54ff.
108. Lordship and Discipleship, p. 65 and n. 2. A view very similar to this latter idea of 'entry into the divine sphere' is that of A. Descamps (Op. Cit., pp. 87ff.) who, on the OT basis that there is an affinity between 'justice' and 'glory', thinks that ἐδικαιώθη here refers to a re-entry into the divine glory. This view is subject to the same criticism as that of E. Schweizer's.
109. "Aspects of Worship", p. 32, n. 90. Cf. E. Schweizer, Lordship, p. 65, n. 2.

It is certainly questionable whether the idea of "entry into the divine sphere" is the same as the Hebraic idea of vindication or 'putting a person in the right'. As R.H. Gundry observes:¹¹⁰

"Schweizer thinks that the more hebraic "declared righteous, vindicated, validated" comes to about the same meaning as the Hellenistic 'divinized', for both refer to entry into the divine sphere. But Schweizer's parallel references from the New Testament period and before - Romans 3:4 (=Ps. 51.6); Psalms of Solomon 2:16; 3:5; 4:9; 8:7 - carry only the meaning of vindication, not entry into the divine sphere".

Nevertheless, it is not difficult to follow Prof. Schweizer's line of argument. In his approach, Christ's resurrection, ascension, appointment as 'Lord' and 'Son of God', and enthronement at the right hand of God are not a chronological sequence of events but varying descriptions of one event, his exaltation (or entry into the divine sphere); and Jesus' exalted existence in the divine world above is to be contrasted to his prior humiliated existence on earth below.¹¹¹ Therefore, in I.3.16b, Christ's exalted existence (entry into the divine sphere) in line ii was God's vindication that the One manifested in the flesh (line i) was 'the Righteous One'. And, "...how does this justification come about? The following four stages describe the triumphal procession of the exalted One through the terrestrial and celestial spaces..."¹¹²

But does this do justice to the forensic sense of

ἐδικαιώθη? On the one hand, it may be argued that Christ's

110. Op. Cit., p. 210.

111. For references to this approach, see his Lordship and Discipleship, esp. pp. 37-8, 52, 65-9, 62-3, 98. For an introduction to Prof. Schweizer's approach to I.3.16b, supra, 52f.

112. Ibid., p. 65.

earthly existence ending in his death and followed by the various stages of exaltation constitute in themselves the deliberations of the lawcourt. This is apparently Prof. Schweizer's view:¹¹³

"But how is exaltation understood here [in 1. ii]? Jesus is 'justified', proved to be righteous by it. This is also the oldest view according to which the Easter events meant the justification of Jesus' way, his vindication. They proved that Jesus was the 'Righteous One'. The idea is that of a lawsuit between God and the world, as it is often found in the OT. Not the world, the sinner, is the accused with God or his Messiah who is accused and rejected by the world".

However, one cannot help but feel that the judge and the lawcourt take a back seat to Christ's 'triumphal procession' into heaven in this interpretation. This is because Schweizer equates Christ's 'justification' with his 'exaltation'; viz. he equates the favourable verdict which was reached in the forensic context with the compensation which was given to Jesus because he was in the right. The effect of this equation is to divert attention away from the verdict itself to the 'evidence' that this verdict was reached. It also lends a certain ambiguity to the entire interpretation.

Another viewpoint which is not so difficult to understand and which also seeks to combine both the forensic and the soteriological senses of ἐδικαιώθη is that of H. Zimmermann. Although allowing for the possibility of Schweizer's interpretation, Zimmermann prefers the following approach:¹¹⁴

"Das sachlich mit ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι Gemeinte wird Jo 16, 8-10 dargelegt: Der Paraklet überführt den κόσμος der δικαιοσύνης. Dabei ist nicht an das Endgericht gedacht, sondern an das gegenwärtige Wirken des Parakleten nach dem Heimgang Jesu zum Vater".

113. Ibid.

114. Op. Cit., pp. 210f. Cf. G. Holtz, Op. Cit., p. 91.

In this view, the debate over the verdict is still going on. The unbelieving world thought that they were in the right when they accused and crucified Jesus and gained the apparent victory. Jesus was the 'accursed' through his death on the cross (Deut. 21.23). But what at first appeared as defeat proved to be the first step to victory. For Jesus is now exalted in heaven and the Holy Spirit continues to reveal him as the true victor.¹¹⁵

One difficulty with this view, as Zimmermann admits, lies not so much with the interpretation of ἐδικαιώθη as with that of ἐν πνεύματι, since it is probable that ἐν is not instrumental (by means of the Spirit) but locative (in the realm of spirit).¹¹⁶ But he suggests that a similar sense may still be found in spite of this grammatical restriction. Another difficulty is that this interpretation does not fit neatly into the spatial contrast of earth/heaven supposedly present in I.3.16b.¹¹⁷ It is true that Zimmermann refers to ἐν πνεύματι as "der Bereich des Göttlichen".¹¹⁸ But the activity of the Spirit in vindicating Jesus takes place on earth among men. Of course, there is always the possibility that a contrast of earth and heaven in lines i and ii does not really exist. But perhaps there is another alternative.

First, the contribution of Schweizer (et al.) that ἐδικαιώθη bears the Hebraic nuance 'to vindicate', 'to redress', 'to put in the right', may be accepted.¹¹⁹ The

115. Ibid.

116. Infra, pp. 129ff.

117. Supra, pp. 56ff., 81.

118. Op. Cit., p. 211.

119. It is not necessary, however, to follow him when he equates Jesus' vindication to "entry into the divine sphere".

context of the entire form witnesses to the presence of this nuance. Furthermore, his description of the forensic metaphor as being that of "a lawsuit between God and the world" enacted in history may be used. However, to preserve the forensic metaphor from being overridden by soteriological connotations, it may be suggested that ἐδικαιώθη is not directing attention to any specific event such as the resurrection, ascension or even Schweizer's 'exaltation'. Like ἐφανερώθη,¹²⁰ it may be a 'perfective' aorist, in which case the emphasis would fall on the results of such events. Its purpose would be to direct attention to the 'vindication' of Jesus by God with the consequent clearing up of misapprehension which came his way during his earthly manifestation. Hence, subsequent to his manifestation in the realm of flesh, he was shown to be God's Messiah in the realm of spirit. Herein lies the parallelism of lines i and ii.¹²¹ There may also be present some sense of the 'gnomic' aorist which is "a timeless and almost futuristic aorist, expressing axioms which avail for all time".¹²² An interesting parallel here would be Luke 7.35: "wisdom is justified (ἐδικαιώθη - a general statement) of all her children".

120. Supra, pp. 103f.; infra, pp. 274ff.

121. In this way it is possible for the soteriological connotation to complement the forensic rather than simply displace it (as in Dibelius) or override it (as in Schweizer). Furthermore, one may agree with Zimmermann's point of view that the verdict of the innocence of Jesus which is based in history (supra, pp. 117f.) touches the lives of men and becomes an important aspect of faith as the Paraclete convicts men concerning righteousness (Jn. 16.8-10), without detracting from the spatial categories present (infra, p. 270).

122. Cf. J.H. Moulton and N. Turner, Grammar, III, p. 73.

iii) There remains one further nuance of δικαιόω found in the lexicons which has not yet been considered - to acquit or pronounce and treat as righteous. There is some question as to whether this nuance should be stated exactly in this way. T.W. Manson is of the opinion that (for Paul) where man is concerned, δικαιόω

"means not so much 'declare righteous' as 'regard as righteous', not so much 'acquit' as 'lay no charge'. There is no sense in declaring a man righteous unless he is righteous; but you may regard him as righteous whether he is or not".¹²³

Whether or not Manson's interpretation is correct may be questioned. But the answer does not affect the conclusion here. For in both cases, the object of this third nuance is sinful man; and for this reason it is generally regarded as having no direct bearing on the interpretation of ἐδικαιώθη in line ii. For the object of ἐδικαιώθη (subject of the passive form) is "the Righteous One", who needed neither to be declared righteous nor to be regarded as righteous. This brings us back to the second nuance - to be vindicated as righteous.

2) An analysis of ἐν πνεύματι :

To reach agreement on the interpretation of ἐν πνεύματι is no small task. This is evident from the numerous inter-

123. Op. Cit., p. 54. Note also the discussion by D. Hill, Op. Cit., p. 160. Cf. M. Dibelius, Op. Cit., p. 50f.; E. Schweizer, Erniedrigung, p. 64; and G. Holtz, Op. Cit., p. 91.

It is commonly held that δικαιόω in the NT does not mean "to make righteous" in an ethical sense such as "to make virtuous". For reasons why this rendering is unacceptable, cf. W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, Op. Cit., pp. 30f.; T.W. Manson, Op. Cit., p. 54; also C.K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (BNTC), London, 1957, p. 75f.

pretations which have been suggested in the past:

the Holy Spirit
 Jesus' human spirit (the immaterial part of his human
 the divine personality of Jesus nature)
 Christ's resurrection body
 the sphere of 'celestial substance'
 the sphere of spirit (of the Holy Spirit; of the Divine)

Only through a careful analysis of the phrase in relation to its context can some contribution towards this end be made.

In this regard, the analysis of form (Chap. I) suggested that I.3.16b is patterned after a 3x2 arrangement with the following characteristics: a progression in pairs from one - many - all; a progression in pairs from revelatory action - publication - reception; and an apparent contrast of two spheres of existence in chiastic order, one below (lines i, iv and v) and the other above (lines ii, iii and vi).¹²⁴ If this is accepted, then the first clues from the context are found as to the direction the interpretation of ἐν πνεύματι should take. Also, it was suggested, since ἐν πνεύματι contrasts with ἐν σαρκί, that the two lines should not be considered separately in their interpretation but should be drawn together in an attempt to understand why they have been contrasted with each other.¹²⁵ Hence, this analysis is not entirely at a loss methodologically speaking in an attempt to interpret ἐν πνεύματι.

But 'contextual analysis' is only a tool, the effectiveness of which depends upon one's awareness of the special

124. Supra, p. 59.

125. Supra, pp. 86f.

character of a term such as πνεῦμα. To speak of the Divine Spirit or the sphere of the Divine, of the 'realm of celestial substance' or of the resurrected Christ, of that which gives life or is the immaterial and invisible source behind life, is not comparable to speaking of any random circumstance or reality that can be identified empirically at any time, such as σάρξ. In I.3.16b, ἐν πνεύματι is used metaphorically, and the intended reality of which the term speaks is, to some extent, hidden to us in its true essence.¹²⁶ Therefore, a certain ambiguity or imprecision is bound to accompany the term. One must also take into account the diversity of its usage elsewhere in the New Testament. The Primitive Church viewed themselves as living in a New Age, the Age of the Spirit. From their experience of the risen/ascended Christ who has now become the life-giving Spirit, and from their reception of the gifts of the Spirit, the Church could not divorce its use of πνεῦμα from these far-reaching concepts. Due to these causes, it is no wonder that there is a diversity and lack of precision in the usage of πνεῦμα throughout the New Testament. Of course, the term may have a precise meaning within a specific reference. But it is not always possible, nor always of any use, to limit πνεῦμα in every instance.

There are also reasons stemming from the history of the

126. Etymologically, πνεῦμα meant 'breath', 'wind'. Metaphorically, in the NT, πνεῦμα is used to refer to that inner reality of ourselves or to that reality outside ourselves which is the source of life.

term πνεῦμα which compound the difficulty of reaching a more precise interpretation. A survey of both Hebraic and Greek usage shows that רוּחַ (πνεῦμα) covered the meanings of 'wind' and 'breath of life'. But there was an essential difference between the Hebrew and Greek understanding of the term. In Greek thought:¹²⁷

"...there is no evidence of the personalizing of πνεῦμα, and in fact it would seem that πνεῦμα remains, till the end of the first Christian century, a name of the substance, refined, ethereal, penetrating the whole cosmos (anima mundi) but not yet immaterial, the substance of which God and the human soul are composed: it denotes neither the human spirit nor personal divine spirit".

In contrast, we find in the Old Testament that רוּחַ is not only used "to denote aspects of, or impulses within the psychical life of man",¹²⁸ but is also used in the phrase רוּחַ ה' רוּחַ to connote the source of special powers in men:¹²⁹

"He (רוּחַ ה' רוּחַ) is given to men as a participation in the divine power and wisdom, and his appearance makes clear simply the influx into the world of a higher might or knowledge".

The question remains whether the Greek word πνεῦμα as it is used in the LXX, the New Testament and especially for our purposes in the phrase ἐν πνεύματι preserves something of this Hebraic concept of 'active divine power' or whether it connotes some kind of impersonal force or substance separable from God as in Greek usage; or perhaps there is a combination of the two.

In view of these considerations, dogmatism should be avoided in the interpretation of ἐν πνεύματι. Nevertheless,

127. D. Hill, Op. Cit., p. 205.

128. Ibid., p. 217.

129. L. Cerfaux, Op. Cit., p. 294.

through an awareness of the problems of the particular nature and history of the term πνεῦμα, it is possible that a reasonable, if not precise, interpretation of the phrase may be reached by means of contextual analysis.

Ἐν πνεύματι:

Since it is important to follow closely the method of contextual analysis, it is helpful at the outset to review the basic interpretation of ἐν σαρκί in line i.¹³⁰ It means that Jesus 'belonged to the terrestrial world, the realm of the earthly and natural, of the purely human'; a realm which is "morally neutral as long as one merely lives within it".¹³¹ In this sense, ἐν is used as a locative. But ἐν σαρκί should also be viewed as a dative of reference. For the phrase 'should not be limited to the general realm of human existence in which he appeared'. It refers to the individual human manifestation of Jesus as well.

In comparison, there are several interpretations of ἐν πνεύματι which may be considered improbable. i) A. Plummer regards ἐν πνεύματι as referring to "the immaterial part of his nature and the higher portion of it".¹³² But this interpretation is unlikely for two reasons. First, it is unlikely that lines i and ii are dividing Jesus up in 'parts', as though Jesus appeared (in line i) only with his covering. It is quite certain that ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί speaks of his appearance as a complete human being and not simply in terms

130. Supra, pp. 106ff.

131. R. Jewett, Op. Cit., p. 115.

132. The Pastoral Epistles, London, 1894, p. 136.

of the outward and visible part of his human nature. Therefore, line ii should not be limited to the inward and invisible part of Jesus' human nature. Second, if ἐν is used as a locative in both lines, then both actions would take place in the same realm here on earth. This would make nonsense of the contrast of realms.

Similar to Plummer's view is that of R.H. Gundry who also interprets ἐν πνεύματι as referring to "the individual human spirit of Christ". But for Gundry, ἐν πνεύματι relates not to Christ's earthly existence but to his vindication "in spirit-form between death and resurrection (cf. I Pet. 3:18ff.)". He argues:¹³³

"...although ἐν πνεύματι and ἐν σαρκί may denote contrasting realms of being, it is doubtful that they do so apart from very particular and individualistic references in context... just as ἐν σαρκί surely denotes the individual physical manifestation of Christ as well as the general sphere in which his manifestation took place, so also ἐν πνεύματι denotes the individual human spirit of Christ as well as the general sphere in which his vindication took place".

"Only an exaggerated view of the unitary nature of man will rule out a dual reference here to Christ's flesh and spirit. Within the Biblical understanding of man there is a subdued dualism, or rather, duality".

Elsewhere he reasons that ἐν πνεύματι stands in contrast "to Christ's appearance in flesh, the flesh of his human body".¹³⁴

On the one hand, it is accepted that, just as ἐν σαρκί denotes the person manifested, ἐν πνεύματι should denote the person vindicated. But if ἐν σαρκί refers to the whole

133. For all these references, review the following pages in his article (Op. Cit.): pp. 211 (and n. 2), 213f and 217f. Infra, pp. 248ff.

134. Ibid., p. 213.

person of Jesus (and not just to 'the flesh of his human body') in his human existence, then ἐν πνεύματι should naturally refer to his entire person in his resurrection existence (σῶμα included). Hence, it is not necessary to revert to the Greek notion of the immortality of the soul. This will become more evident below when we consider Paul's defense of Christ's resurrection in I Cor. 15.35ff., in which he defines the nature of the risen Christ not in terms of a continuing human spirit but in terms of a new spiritual body.¹³⁵ Moreover, this is probably the interpretation of the σὰρξ/πνεῦμα contrast in I Pet. 3.18ff. as well. Concerning this passage, J.N.D. Kelly notes that "flesh and spirit do not here designate complementary parts of Christ, but the whole Christ regarded from different standpoints", from the human and spiritual spheres of existence.¹³⁶

ii) Another improbable interpretation is that which views ἐν πνεύματι as an instrumental dative and translates it "by means of the Holy Spirit". Some scholars have been convinced of this interpretation by certain details about the life and resurrection of Jesus.¹³⁷ Both Matthew and Luke open with narratives in which the Spirit is made responsible for Jesus' birth.¹³⁸ All the Evangelists relate how the Spirit in all its fullness came upon Jesus at his baptism,¹³⁹ and how Jesus

135. Infra, pp. 134ff.

136. The Epistles of Peter and of Jude (BNTC), London, 1969, p. 151.

137. W. Hendriksen, Op. Cit., p. 140; W. Lock, Op. Cit., pp. 45f.; B. Schneider, Op. Cit., p. 385; C.K. Barrett, Op. Cit., p. 65; J.P. Lilley, Op. Cit., p. 111.

138. Mt. 1.18ff; Lk. 1.35. See also Lk. 1.15, 67f.

139. Mt. 3.16; Mk. 1.10; Lk. 3.22; Jn. 1.32.

exercised the Spirit's power throughout his subsequent career.¹⁴⁰ Moreover, it was characteristic of the Spirit to 'make alive' (John 6.63), and Paul attributes to the work of the Spirit the resurrection of Jesus Christ (Rom. 8.11). In this light, it is probable that more is implied in the later phrase of I Pet. 3.18de - "put to death in the flesh, made alive (ζωοποιήσεις) in the spirit" - than simply a reference to the spiritual sphere or his human spirit.¹⁴¹ There is also the parallel κατὰ σάρκα / κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης antithesis in Rom. 1.3-4 in which some reference is implicit in the latter member to the Holy Spirit.¹⁴² All of these literary parallels might suggest that ἐν πνεύματι refers to the work of the Spirit.

But this interpretation does not take seriously the parallelism of the first two clauses. While it would not be

140. Mt. 3.11; 4.1ff.; 12.18, 28; Mk. 1.12; Lk. 3.16; 4.18; 10.21f. John does not emphasize the relation of the Spirit to the life of Jesus, but thinks of it in terms of the Spirit's coming after Jesus' departure.

141. Although I Pet. 3.18e is probably to be taken impersonally as referring to 'the sphere of spirit', the use of ζωοποιήσεις would suggest that it is a sphere in which the Holy Spirit is active. Cf. the discussion of W.J. Dalton, Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits, Rome, 1965, pp. 124ff., esp. p. 134.

142. W.C. van Unnik ("Jesus the Christ", NTS, 8 (1961-2) pp. 108) translates κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης as "Spirit Holiness", regarding it as "a Semitic circumscription" for the usual πνεῦμα ἅγιον. C.K. Barrett (Romans, pp. 18f.) interprets it also as the Third Person of the Trinity (as Patristic writers generally, and some moderns), and sees a contrast between the spheres of the human and the divine. Not all scholars agree with this view. But it does seem likely that, if the phrase does not refer explicitly to the Holy Spirit, it does at least suggest overtones of meaning in this regard.

difficult to understand ἐν πνεύματι as an instrumental dative, this is out of the question for ἐν σαρκί which is locative in force. Moreover, the spatial contrast throughout the form would suggest a locative rather than an instrumental usage.

Note R.H. Gundry's thoughts in this regard:¹⁴³

"Alone, these arguments are admittedly indecisive, for Romans 1.4 contains a contrast between Jesus' flesh and the Holy Spirit. Again, in I Timothy 3.16 the simple dative ἐν δόξῃ in line 3 interrupts the parallel ἐν's so that the parallelism is neither perfect nor complete. The string of ἐν's may come from the desire for similar sound without the requirement of identical sense. It has even been questioned whether early Christians distinguished Christ's human spirit from the Holy Spirit¹⁴⁴ ...Taken together, nevertheless, the unlikelihood of an instrumental ἐν in the hymnic quotation and the greater naturalness in the pairing of Jesus' own flesh and spirit tip the scales against a reference to the Holy Spirit".

Furthermore, the parallelism would suggest that just as line i denotes Jesus' individual physical manifestation, so also line ii denotes primarily his individual spiritual vindication.¹⁴⁴ Any attempt, therefore, to view ἐν πνεύματι as

143. Op. Cit., pp. 210, 212. The argument from parallelism in this case is not as strong as is usually contended. For as line iii so well reminds us, what is emphasized there is not the spatial but the personal aspect (ἐν δόξῃ). The same could be argued in lines iv and v. Moreover, with N.J.D. White (The Pastoral Epistles [EGT, IV], London, 1910, p. 119), one dares not assume that the ἐν before πνεύματι has the same force it has before σαρκί; for the repetition of the preposition may be due simply to the felt need of rhythmical effect. Someone might object that line iii rules that out since it contains no ἐν. But it could also be suggested that the original might have included a preposition there (supra, p. 17, n. 17.).

144. Cf. J.N.D. Kelly, Op. Cit., pp. 90f. Gundry questions this by referring to the following references: Mk. 2.8; 8.12; 15.37; Mt. 27.50; Lk. 23.46; Jn. 11.33; 13.21; 19.30. But Kelly does not appear to be referring to Christ's 'human spirit', but to his resurrected, spiritual nature.

referring primarily to the Holy Spirit has the effect of diminishing the correlation between the two lines. As E.K. Simpson makes clear: "...it is the Second Person whose glory this lyrical canto chants".¹⁴⁵

iii) Another improbable interpretation is that expressed by H.A. Kent. He concludes that since ἐν πνεύματι refers neither to the Holy Spirit nor to Jesus' own human spirit, it must refer to "Christ's divine nature" which resided in his own spirit:¹⁴⁶

"Although His deity was often veiled during his ministry, at times the veil was lifted and pronouncement was made that the incarnate Jesus was the divine Son of God, and was absolutely righteous. Such occurred at baptism, transfiguration, resurrection, ascension, and on other less prominent occasions".

Although Kent does not exhibit the dualistic view of A. Plummer, he does divide the person of Christ into two parts - the human and the divine. That such a distinction was made by the author of the form seems very doubtful, since the form was probably written before such theological distinctions were being made. Furthermore, this interpretation of ἐν πνεύματι, like that of A. Plummer's, would place the action of line 11 in the same realm as that of line 1, making void any contrast of spheres in the form.

In what way, then, is ἐν πνεύματι to be interpreted? The use of the locative sense in line 1 together with the

145. Op. Cit., p. 62.

146. The Pastoral Epistles, Chicago, 1958, pp. 145f. J.N.D. Kelly (Op. Cit., p. 90) also suggests that we have here "the divine and human elements in Christ's being..." But he qualifies this by adding: "he was vindicated...shown to be in fact Son of God, in respect of his spiritual nature, a reference to the resurrection being implied". This does not exhibit the same dualism as that of Kent, and could very well have been implied in the early church.

apparent contrast of spheres throughout the form suggests that it should be interpreted - 'in the sphere of spirit'. According to scholars such as E. Schweizer and M. Dibelius (H. Conzelmann):¹⁴⁷

"The phrases ἐν σαρκί and ἐν πνεύματι are intended to designate the two halves of the cosmos and the two spheres of existence (Seinssphaeren), the one above and the one below. The Redeemer entered the sphere of a human existence at His incarnation. He was taken into the sphere of the Spirit at His exaltation. The 'flesh' is the sphere in which the divine epiphany took place; and the 'spirit' is the corresponding sphere in which the exaltation occurred".

On the one hand, J.N.D. Kelly points out that ἐν πνεύματι alone "does not naturally suggest 'the sphere of spirit'".¹⁴⁸ However, within the context of I.3.16b it seems natural enough to give it this somewhat abstract meaning. It suggests above all else a spatial, regional contrast between earth below and heaven above. But care must be taken not to push the analogy too far so that its 'preciseness' rules out other probable connotations of the phrase. E. Schweizer recognizes this danger when he writes:¹⁴⁹

"It follows that ἐν πνεύματι, which is contrasted with ἐν σαρκί, must be rendered in the sphere of the Spirit'... πνεύματι then not merely describes a spatial realm, but qualifies this as the realm of celestial substance. It is taken for granted in all this that the nature of the Redeemer is 'spiritual'..."

In other words, Schweizer finds more than the regional sense implied in the phrase. For him, there are also connotations

147. This summary statement of their views was given by R.P. Martin, "Aspects of Worship", p. 24. Cf. E. Schweizer, Erniedrigung, pp. 63f.; idem., Lordship, pp. 64f.; M. Dibelius, Op. Cit., (1955³), pp. 50f.; B.S. Easton, Op. Cit., pp. 136f.

148. Op. Cit., p. 90.

149. Spirit of God, London, 1960, p. 57. B.S. Easton (Op. Cit., p. 136f.) describes it further as "the supernatural world". M. Dibelius (Op. Cit., p. 50) describes it as "die göttliche Sphäre, die Sphäre der δικαιοσύνη".

as to the nature of this regional existence and the spiritual nature of Christ. Indeed, it is not an easy thing to think of Christ as identified solely with an abstract sphere of existence, de-personalized and without an independent form of his own. Of course, it is difficult to determine exactly how far Prof. Schweizer is willing to proceed in I.3.16b along these lines of thought. But it will be beneficial to follow his lead.

Schweizer qualifies the locative sense of ἐν πνεύματι as "the realm of celestial substance". This qualification is consistent with the parallelism of the first two clauses. For if ἐν σαρκί as representative of the earthly sphere is indicative of the substance of which earthly beings are made, then ἐν πνεύματι as representative of the heavenly sphere is indicative of the substance of which heavenly beings are made. This is suggested elsewhere in Scripture where πνεῦμα is used generically to denote the whole class of intelligent beings who are not conditioned by a fleshly body. Thus we find πνεῦμα used with reference to God, the risen Christ, the Holy Spirit, the angels of God, demons, and the spirit of man separated from the body after death.¹⁵⁰ Moreover, in I Cor. 15.35ff. we note how Paul believed that eschatological man would possess a 'spiritual body' (σῶμα πνευματικόν). Concerning this phrase and the context in which it stands, several

150. For an extensive list of the references so used, see E. DeWitt Burton, Spirit, Soul and Flesh, Chicago, 1918, pp. 179-82, under the caption "B. Unembodied or disembodied spirit". Note how "the Father of the spirits" is antipodal to the "fathers according to the flesh" in Heb. 12.9.

points should be made which are relevant to our present discussion.

In I Cor. 15.1-34, Paul has been arguing that Jesus' resurrection is the surety of the general resurrection. Then in v.35, anticipating the skepticism which operates from the Greek notion of the immortality of the soul, he raises the question (here paraphrased):

"In death the body decays. How then will the body be raised up?"

His answer may seem naive and unscientific, but the message comes through clearly. The risen body has nothing in common with the body laid in the grave. The seed dies and God gives it a new body (vv.36-38). Σαρξ καὶ αἷμα are not able to inherit God's kingdom; but we shall all be changed (πάντες δὲ ἀλλοτριοῦμεθα - v. 51).¹⁵¹ While this does not support the traditional Jewish belief in a completely corporeal resurrection, it also fails to support the Greek notion of soul-immortality.¹⁵² For the σῶμα πνευματικόν is not a lingering on from the σῶμα ψυχικόν (v. 44), but is the product of the power of God, an eschatological gift from heaven (vv. 45f.);

151. There are textual variants which would change the meaning of the verse to "we shall sleep, but we shall not all be changed". But the textual evidence for the accepted rendering is stronger, and this variant reading appears to go against the entire argument of the passage.

152. Paul was not alone in his time in going against the traditionally held Jewish view. W.D. Davies (Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1962, pp. 301-8) points out that certain Jewish theologians had at least modified if not completely altered the old view. They held instead that the resurrection body would be a non-corporeal, or at least a non-fleshly body, more like that of angels than like that of the body of sin and death.

and whereas σῶμα ψυχικόν is characterized by corruption, dishonour and weakness, σῶμα πνευματικόν is characterized by incorruption, glory and power. The seed dies and God gives it a new body! Moreover, it is important to note the source of this pneumatic existence, the last Adam (i.e. Christ) who became 'life-giving Spirit' (πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν).¹⁵³

"In his resurrection Christ became 'Spirit' and as 'life-giving Spirit' is able to raise those who are his: in their resurrection, the form of existence shared with Adam will give way to a new mode of being, shared with the living Christ, a mode of being defined (by reason of its source) as 'Spirit', within which there is continuity of essential personality and individuality (σῶμα)".

Having described Paul's line of thought in I Cor. 15.35ff., how does this help to clarify the meaning of ἐν πνεύματι in I.3.61b? First, it is important to observe how Paul contrasts two spheres of existence throughout the former passage by means of the following autonomous pairs:

- v. 40 - σώματα ἐπίγεια / σώματα ἐπουράνια
- v. 42 - φθορᾶ / ἀφθαρσίᾳ
- v. 43 - ἀτιμίᾳ / δόξῃ
ἀσθενείᾳ / δυνάμει
- v. 44 - σῶμα ψυχικόν / σῶμα πνευματικόν
- vv. 48f. - χοϊκοῦ / ἐπουρανίου
- v. 50 - σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα / βασιλείαν θεοῦ

They all point to the same contrast, the present earthly existence over against the eschatological heavenly existence, a contrast very similar to that found in I.3.16b. Closely connected to this contrast of spheres is the parallel contrast of

153. D. Hill, Op. Cit., p. 282.

the two Adams within the same context:

- v. 45 - ὁ πρῶτος ... Ἀδὰμ / ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ
ψυχὴν ζῶσαν / πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν
- v. 46 - τὸ ψυχικόν / τὸ πνευματικόν
- vv. 47f. - ὁ χοϊκός / ὁ ἐπουράνιος
ἐκ γῆς / ἐξ οὐρανοῦ

For R. Scroggs, this extensive contrast holds the following meaning:¹⁵⁴

"(Paul) does not choose to say directly that Christ now possesses a spiritual body; Christ is, rather, the Spirit which creates life (I Cor. 15.45). Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that Paul assumes Christ does exist in a spiritual σῶμα. As a result of the life-giving πνεῦμα, the believer will also possess a spiritual body..."

Therefore, it is certain not only that the early church was familiar with this contrast of spheres but that it thought of Jesus' present existence as somehow characterized by πνεῦμα.

Does this mean that Paul was defining this eschatological, pneumatic existence in terms of material or substance? Although this Hellenistic understanding of πνεῦμα might have had some influence on Paul,¹⁵⁵ it does not appear to be stressed here. As was noted above, σῶμα πνευματικόν is not explained in terms of the Greek notion of spirit-substance which guarantees the continuance of life. Indeed, the numerous contrasts which Paul uses seem to suggest that he is searching for some way to express the reality of resurrection

154. Op. Cit., p. 94.

155. E. Schweizer (TWNT, VI, pp. 390ff.; 413ff.) argues that the Hellenistic understanding of πνεῦμα as substance was influential in the early church, and that Paul accepted this Hellenistic line of thought but modified it through continual insistence upon eschatology, faith and the necessity for obedience.

existence without exchanging one substance (οὐρανὸς καὶ αἶμα) for another.¹⁵⁶ What is stressed here is a new existence originating in the personal power of God. Christ has become 'life-giving Spirit' in a new aeon, perhaps reminiscent of the powerful Spirit and breath of God in the creation of the old aeon and of the first Adam (Gen. 1.2ff.; 2.7). In contrast to the present existence, this eschatological existence will be a new mode of existence defined by reason of its source as πνεῦμα.

This line of thought could be equally applicable to I.3.16b and ἐν πνεύματι. In contrast to his manifestation in the flesh, the vindicated Christ (as the first-born of the dead) would now be experiencing eschatological existence generally defined as πνεῦμα. The phrase does not have to be thought of in terms of 'celestial substance', but rather as a heavenly sphere of existence in which the personal power (Spirit) of God is active. It would be a sphere of existence which Christ shares with angels (line iii) and in which he is 'received ἐν δόξῃ' (line vi).

156. R. Scroggs (The Last Adam, Oxford, 1966, p. 66) comments: "Here Paul wrestles with several terms, apparently acknowledging the difficulty of speaking precisely about what cannot be known. He seems to emphasize, by its climactic position, the term σῶμα πνευματικόν, the 'spiritual body'. By this Paul at least means a body foreign to any possibility within this world...a non-corporeal existence with its source in the power of God's gift. Paul, everyone might well agree, did wisely in not attempting a more precise description of eschatological man". In a footnote (19), he continues: "Most exegetes also wisely refrain from suggesting too precise a meaning for Paul". For a helpful consideration of this question, cf. M.E. Dahl, The Resurrection of the Body, London, 1962, esp. pp. 81ff.

As has been pointed out above, this understanding of Christ's resurrection existence is not really Hebraic in the sense of the physical resurrection of the body. Nor is it Hellenistic in the sense of the immortality of the soul and the continuation of a 'spirit-substance'. It has been influenced by both, but is not to be identified with either. It may be that the author of I.3.16b had a similar understanding of Christ's resurrection existence in view in line ii. This suggestion commends itself because, on the one hand, ἐν πνεύματι stands directly opposite ἐν σαρκί, suggesting that it has nothing to do with the continuation of the physical. On the other hand, there is no suggestion that its contrasting partner, ἐν σαρκί, carries any of the Hellenistic nuances such as the material part of his earthly existence or the depreciation of the flesh. Rather, ἐν σαρκί suggests the more Hebraic understanding of the whole man; and the more positive nuance of 'putting a person in the right' makes it clear that ἐδικαιώθη is also used in the Hebraic sense 'to redress'.¹⁵⁷ Therefore, it appears likely that the author's understanding of ἐν πνεύματι may have been similar to the non-Hellenized viewpoint of Paul in I Cor. 15.35ff.

But there is no room for dogmatism at this point, for there simply is not enough evidence at hand. Moreover, in the historical analysis below, it will be observed that Hebraic and Hellenistic thought in the first century A.D. were not all that distinct.¹⁵⁸ Hellenism had invaded

157. Supra, pp. 113ff.

158. Infra, pp. 183ff.

Palestine (and vice versa) more than scholars in the past have realized. There are even signs that Paul, who was responsible for writing I Cor. 15.35ff., may have been influenced in part by Greek dualism. Moreover, one must consider how the audience would have interpreted ἐν πνεύματι. If I.3.16b were recited in a Hellenistic-Gentile Christian community, it is probable that the nuance of substance was present in the minds of many. Also, due to the fusion of Hebraic and Hellenistic ideas in the Christian era, it may be that many Jewish Christians would have thought in a similar vein. Who is in a position to say otherwise?

d. Concluding analysis of lines i and ii:

In this concluding analysis of lines i and ii, an attempt will be made to clarify their basic meaning by collating the evidence thus far presented. This is done with the full awareness that in the past, interpretations have varied widely among scholars. This was due to several factors, the most important of which are the conciseness of the lines and the diversity of the historical usage of the words. Without some guideline to direct in analysis, it is virtually impossible to reach any agreement as to their meaning. For this reason, the two lines are being analyzed as a couplet rather than as two individual units, thus using the results of the analysis of form (Chap. I). Hitherto, it has not been possible to present a concise, coherent explanation of their meaning because of the numerous questions raised with

159. Cf. E. Schweizer, Spirit of God, pp. 54ff.

reference to each word and line; hence, this concluding analysis.

In arriving at the probable interpretation of lines i and ii, ἐν σαρκί and ἐν πνεύματι should be considered together. Most scholars agree that these two dative nouns antithesize two realms of existence, the terrestrial world and the celestial world, the realm of human existence and the realm of divine existence. But more than this, ἐν σαρκί refers to the individual, incarnate life of Jesus. He was in the fullest sense a human being.¹⁶⁰ Antipodal to this, ἐν πνεύματι does not refer to the Holy Spirit, nor to the human spirit of Jesus, nor to the divine nature which he possessed while on earth. Instead, 'in spirit' must refer to the individual, resurrected life of Jesus, an existence characterized by πνεῦμα.¹⁶¹ In this respect, ἐν πνεύματι is not to be thought of in terms of the Greek concept of the immortality of the soul. Nor is it necessary to think in terms of 'celestial substance'. As in I Cor. 15.35ff., ἐν πνεύματι may denote simply the nature of the resurrected Christ's existence, defined by reason of its source as πνεῦμα. In this case, the author's use of ἐν πνεύματι would not be aligned with either the Hebraic or Hellenistic understanding of πνεῦμα. Nevertheless, those who recited I.3.16b may have thought of ἐν πνεύματι in terms of their respective backgrounds.

The verbs ἐφανερώθη and ἐδικαιώθη are also inter-related,

160. Supra, pp. 105ff.

161. Supra, pp. 133ff.

but not to the same extent as the nouns. In each case, the verb is not directing attention to any particular event in the life of Jesus. It is true that many scholars think it is necessary to restrict the lines to such events because of the implications of the aorist tense. However, the diversity of their interpretations as well as their failure to consider all the relevant texts with verbal parallels point to the inadequacy of this approach. Moreover, there is good reason to view ἐφανερώθη as a 'complexive', 'perfective' and/or 'gnomic' aorist.¹⁶² Similarly, ἐδικαιώθη may be viewed as a 'perfective' and/or 'gnomic' aorist.¹⁶³ If this is the case, then the emphasis would fall not on initial events such as the incarnation, death, descent into hell, resurrection or ascension, but on the sequel or consequence of these events; and those who spend their time pinpointing events in the life of Jesus would be missing the point. For the verbs would be directing attention simply to the 'revelation' of the pre-existent One in the realm of flesh as a man, and to his 'vindication' in the realm of spirit as the exalted One.

But ἐδικαιώθη connotes more than the soteriological nuance 'to vindicate'. It also bears a forensic sense, and implies two things. First, it implies that Christ was vindicated 'of something'. On earth, we know that he was misunderstood and falsely accused. Hence, ἐδικαιώθη may imply

162. Supra, pp. 103f.

163. Supra, p. 122.

a certain misunderstanding which arose out of ἐφανερώθη ἐν
σικκί (line i). Perhaps also in the supernatural realm, there was some question as to whether the status of the 'pre-existent One' had changed due to his 'appearance in human form'. Whatever the misapprehension or accusation, Christ was vindicated by God. Second, ἐδικαιώθη implies that Christ received a verdict of 'innocence'. If the verdict stands in contrast to accusations of guilt, then he was vindicated as 'the Righteous One'. If it stands in contrast to misapprehension on earth concerning his person and work, then he was vindicated as God's true revelation and Messiah. If it stands in contrast to doubt in the supernatural realm concerning his divine status, then he was vindicated as 'divine Son'. In any case, God vindicated Christ in due course by giving him a verdict of 'innocence'.¹⁶⁴

2. Ἦρθον ἀγγέλους, ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν:

In the past, much of the difficulty of line iii, Ἦρθον ἀγγέλους, lay in the assumption that it made reference to a particular event in the life of Christ. Thus it has been regarded as referring to the angels present at various occasions in his life and/or the 'two men in white' who 'vindicated' his resurrection to the women;¹⁶⁵ the appearance of

164. Supra, pp. 115ff.

165. Especially representative of this view are W. Hendriksen (Op. Cit., pp. 140f.) and J.B. Rowell (Op. Cit., p. 74). J.P. Lilley (Op. Cit., p. 111) suggests that this 'appearance' cannot be connected with any single event, but notes that Christ's whole incarnate existence as Saviour, esp.

Christ before the 'spirits in prison' between his death and resurrection;¹⁶⁶ the apostolic witnesses of his resurrection (ἄγγελοι can also be interpreted 'messengers');¹⁶⁷ and the appearance of Christ before the angels in heaven during his ascension.¹⁶⁸

However, there are important considerations to be weighed against each of these interpretations. First, those who find

Contd.] his obedience unto death, was 'looked into' by the angelic hosts (I Pet. 1.12). J.H. Bernard (The Pastoral Epistles, Cambridge, 1899, p. 63) explains line iii as "the fuller knowledge of Christ's person which was opened out to the heavenly host by the incarnation". Note also the passing suggestion of W. Barclay (The Letters to Timothy, Titus and Philemon, Glasgow, 1965, p. 104) that angels may have seen Jesus before his birth.

166. R.H. Gundry, Op. Cit., pp. 215f; also O. Cullmann, The Earliest Christian Confessions, trans. J.K.S. Reid, London, 1949, p. 60 and n. 1. Cullmann sees not only an allusion to Christ's descent into hell in line iii, but writes: "The continuation 'preached unto the Gentiles', alludes probably to Christ's preaching to the dead. This preaching is thus mentioned before the ascension. The descent into hell is brought into connection on the one hand with the preaching to the dead (I Peter 3:18f.), and on the other with the conquest of the powers of hades..."
167. This view goes back in time at least as far as A.L.C. Heydenreich (Die Pastoralbriefe Pauli, Hadamar, 1826, pp. 215f.). A. Seeberg (Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit, München, 1966 [1903¹]) held this view, but few scholars since have supported him. Note the interesting defense of this position by W. Micou, "On ὑπὲρ ἁγγέλων, I Tim. 3.16", JBL, 11/2 (1892) pp. 201ff.
168. R. St. J. Parry, Op. Cit., p. 23; L. Brun, Die Auferstehung Christi, Oslo, 1925, pp. 94f. One problem with this interpretation is the possible redundancy with line vi where ἀνελμφάνω, which is sometimes used as a terminus technicus for Christ's ascension, is used. C.K. Barrett (The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 65f.) tries to solve this difficulty by finding reference in line vi to Christ's final victory, the Judgment.

reference to the angels who ministered to Jesus during his lifetime stumble against a proper understanding of ἐφάνη. In both the LXX and the New Testament, ἐφάνη appears as a terminus technicus for the manifestation of the divine, the 'becoming perceptible' of someone not ordinarily seen.¹⁶⁹ Moreover, whenever it is used of Christ, it is used only with reference to his resurrection appearances (I Cor. 15.5ff.; Luke 24.34; Acts 13.31; also Acts 9.17; 26.16). The result is that ἐφάνη "nearly always means the self-exhibition of the subject, 'appeared or showed himself (to)', so that what follows is a true dative rather than an instrumental of agent".¹⁷⁰ But in the case of the ministering angels, they appeared to Christ and not vice versa.¹⁷¹ In this regard, "was seen by angels" is a misleading translation, for it places more emphasis on the sight of the angels than on the appearance of Christ. Perhaps line iii would be better translated,

169. Cf. W. Michaelis, "ἐφάνη", TDNT, V, pp. 355ff.; esp. p. 356, n. 204; also E.G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, London, 1949, p. 326; W. Stenger, Op. Cit., p. 39; and H. Zimmermann, Op. Cit., p. 210. For references in the LXX, consult E. Hatch and H.A. Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint, Oxford, 1897, II, pp. 1005ff. For references in the NT of ἐφάνη relating to supernatural appearances, cf. Mt. 17.3; Mk. 9.4; Lk. 1.11; 22.43; Acts 7.2, 30, 35; 16.9; Rev. 11.19; 12.1, 3. The one exception in the NT in which ἐφάνη is used without reference to supernatural appearances or Christ's resurrection is Acts 7.26. The question as to whether ἐφάνη refers to a 'vision' or to an actual empirical experience is irrelevant here, since this question relates to God's revelation of himself in space and time. But both Christ and the angels in I.3.16b are on the same plane of existence.

170. R.H. Gundry, Op. Cit., p. 214.

171. E.F. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 41.

"appeared to angels".¹⁷²

Second, those who view line iii as referring to the 'descensus Christi ad inferos' and his appearance to the 'spirits in prison' do so only by comparing I.3.16b with I Pet. 3.18ff. But it will become evident below that such a comparison is precarious, not only because of the differences between the two texts, but also because it is not clear that I Pet. 3.18ff. refers to a descent of Christ into hell.¹⁷³

Third, those who find reference here to apostolic messengers who witnessed the resurrection must account for the fact that ἄγγελοι occurs no more than 3 times in the New Testament (out of approximately 175 references) with reference to men.¹⁷⁴ Moreover, the 'angel' motif is found in other confessional and theological passages of similar nature.¹⁷⁵

Fourth, the view which relates ἄγγελοι to the angels present at the resurrection fails to take seriously the parallelism of this term with ἑθνεσιν in line iv. In contrast to the latter, ἄγγελοι should denote a much larger group of angels than just 'two men in white'. Furthermore, there

172. R.H. Gundry (Op. Cit., p. 214) suggests that line iii is so often translated "was seen by angels" because of the desire "to capture the feel of the passive verbal forms in parallel construction" - was manifested, was vindicated, was seen.... For instance, the RSV is consistent in translating ἔφθη 'appeared', with the only exception being I.3.16b 'was seen by angels'.

173. Infra, Chap. III, Sec. B.6.a.

174. Lk. 7.24; 9.52; Jas. 2.25. Cf. G. Kittel, "ἄγγελοι", TDNT, I, pp. 83f.; W.F. Moulton and A.S. Geden (edd.), A Concordance to the Greek Testament, Edinburgh, 1963⁴, pp. 8ff.

175. Cp. Phil. 2.10f.; Col. 2.15; esp. I Pet. 3.22.

would be a problem of redundancy since line ii also suggests that the resurrection has taken place.¹⁷⁶

Fifth, with the exception of the view that line iii refers to Christ's ascension, none of the above interpretations appears to take seriously the structure of the form. The analysis of form (Chap. I) suggested that I.3.16b is patterned after a chiasmic spatial scheme in which line iii - ὑφ' ἁγγέλους - is related to the heavenly sphere of existence. But the above interpretations are this-earth bound, or below the earth. Moreover, the antithetical parallelism of lines iii and iv would suggest one of the following interpretations of line iii, none of which would be consistent with the above renderings:

iv - proclaimed to iii - appeared to

(heathen) lowest creatures / highest creatures (good angels)

Gentiles / angels, principalities and powers

(all) nations / (all) angels

Only the view that line iii refers to Christ's ascension is consistent with this spatial parallelism.

But there are also problems in referring line iii to Christ's appearances before the angels in heaven during his ascension. It was noted above that ὑφ' ἁγγέλους, when used of Christ in the New Testament, refers consistently to his

176. K.H. Rengstorf (Die Auferstehung Jesu, Witten Place/Ruhr, 1967, p. 127) argues that the implication of the resurrection event is always present when ὑφ' ἁγγέλους is used with reference to Christ. This is no doubt correct. However, it was noted above (*supra*, pp. 98ff.) that the birth of Jesus is often implied when ἐκ νεκρῶν is used with reference to him. But it was not concluded, therefore, that line i refers specifically to Jesus' birth. The same could be true of line iii, as the following discussion will suggest.

resurrection appearances.¹⁷⁷ Furthermore, if one insists upon finding events in the life of Christ in each of the lines in I.3.16b, then it is important to note that ἀναλαμβάνω in the New Testament is almost a terminus technicus for Christ's ascension.¹⁷⁸ This means that if line iii refers to the ascension, there would be a possible redundancy in line vi, ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ.

Hence, there are apparent difficulties with each of the above views which proceed on the assumption that line iii refers to a particular event in the life of Christ. Perhaps this assumption should be questioned. In the analysis above, it was suggested that lines i and ii do not refer to specific events in Christ's life. Rather, ἐφανερώθη (l. i) is probably to be taken as a 'complexive' and/or 'perfective' aorist, and ἐδικαιώθη (l. ii) is to be thought of as a 'perfective' and/or 'gnomic' aorist. In this case, the emphasis in both lines would fall on the 'consequence' of the life of Christ and not on specific events.¹⁷⁹ The same could apply to line iii. Furthermore, in keeping with the principle of 'contextual analysis', line iii should be viewed in relation to line iv. The latter line - ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ᾧαντιν - undoubtedly refers to an extension of time.¹⁸⁰ Perhaps the same is true of line iii.

This parallelism of lines iii and iv is an important factor in their interpretation. As in lines i and ii, both

177. Supra, p. 145.

178. Infra, p. 165

179. Supra, pp. 141f.

180. Supra, p. 102.

the verbs and nouns should be compared and contrasted with each other as the context suggests. They should also be compared together with lines v and vi, if the chiasmic antithetical parallel arrangement of the passage is accepted. In this regard, it is important to be more explicit about the use of the verbs in lines iii and iv. It has been suggested that ὑπόθη refers to the worship and/or subjection of the angelic hosts to Christ upon his exaltation. This broad interpretation may be questioned. For if ὑπόθη connotes worship or subjection, then line vi would be redundant. According to Bo Reicke, ὑπόθη "may be considered as very closely approaching a verbal announcement".¹⁸¹ In this sense, it would be parallel to ἐκκηρύχθη, and would anticipate worship and/or subjection (l. vi) even as ἐκκηρύχθη anticipates belief (l. v). What the nations learned through preaching, the angels came to know through seeing.¹⁸² Both verbs convey only the idea of presentation, a demonstration that Christ is Lord both in heaven and on earth.¹⁸³

"Dieser Einführung des Erhöhten in seinen himmlischen Herrschaftsbereich entspricht seine Verkündigung im irdischen Herrschaftsbereich. Die Predigt des Evangeliums von der Erlösung durch Jesus Christus ist die Verkündigung seines Herrschaftsanspruches an die Völker".

181. The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism, København, 1946, pp. 234f.

182. A. Schlatter (Op. Cit., p. 114) points out that since line ii, Christ is no longer visible to men (proclamation), but is visible (ὑπόθη) to angels. J.H. Bernard (Op. Cit., p. 63) explains the parallelism this way: "the revelation to Gentiles is mediate, by preaching, and it was this with which S. Paul was specially entrusted (Eph. 3.8; cf. Rom. 16.26); the revelation to the higher orders of created intelligence is immediate, by vision".

183. J. Jeremias, Timotheus, p. 18.

Furthermore, just as ἐκδηρύνθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν is clearly not yet fulfilled from the present point of view in time, so also ἦρθη ἐκχέουσιν is not necessarily completed.¹⁸⁴ How then can the two verbs be used in the aorist tense? There are several possibilities. First, it may be suggested that both verbs are 'complexive' aorists, viewed from the perspective of the Parousia. For, by the Endzeit, both his proclamation on earth and his appearance in heaven will have accomplished their purpose: "to sum up all things in Christ" (Eph. 1.10). Second, there is the possibility that there is a 'gnomic' sense present here, in which the verbs are used generally to express "axioms which avail for all time". Hence, the aorists would be used in "a timeless and almost futuristic" sense.¹⁸⁵ A possible example might be the aorists in the Magnificat, Luke 1.51-53, which may be 'gnomic'. Third, there may be a combination of the two senses, the 'complexive' and the 'gnomic'. But in any case, it is preferable not to view either of the two lines as referring to specific events, but to the 'presentation' of Christ in both spheres of existence. It is this general truth which these lines are trying to convey.

But to whom was this presentation made? In line iii, there are generally three possible answers to the question 'who'. In the realm of heaven belongs the host of unfallen

184. Note the discussion below, which suggests that Christ's subjection of the 'spirit-powers' has a past-present-future aspect to it (infra, n. 205).

185. Cf. N. Turner, Op. Cit., p. 73.

angels who surround God's throne. Ἀγγέλους may simply be referring to these good angels who worship him and desire to perceive the wonder of the incarnation.¹⁸⁶ On the other hand, heaven - as a constituent part of the universe - can also be the realm of evil powers (e.g. Eph. 6.12). In this case, line iii may be referring to these evil 'spirit-powers' which Christ subjects to himself during his exaltation.¹⁸⁷ The third possibility is that ἄγγέλους refers to both good and evil spirits - all supernatural beings. In I Pet. 3.19, 22, the end result of Christ's exaltation is that angels and authorities and powers are made subject to him. A similar idea is expressed in Phil. 2.10f. with its reference to all things in heaven, on earth and under the earth paying homage to Christ. L. Cerfaux quotes a parallel passage from the Ascension of Isaiah 11.22:¹⁸⁸

"And when he sent his twelve disciples and he went up, I beheld. I beheld him, and he was in the vault of heaven. He had not taken on their form, but all the angels of the firmament and Satan saw him and adored. And there was great sadness and they said: How is it that the Lord has come down upon us and we have not recognized the glory (which clothed him)...?"

-
186. I. Pet. 1.10ff. For an excellent synopsis of the OT understanding of the 'bene ha elohim', the heavenly court of Yahweh, see W. Stenger, Op. Cit., pp. 39f.; also, G. von Rad, TDNT, I, pp. 76ff.; H. Gross, "Der Engel im Alten Testament", Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft, 6/1 (1959) pp. 28ff.; T.H. Gaster, "Angel", The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Nashville, 1962, pp. 128ff.
187. Cf. Gal. 3.19-21; 4.3-5, 8-9; Col. 2.8-10, 15, 20. See W.J. Dalton for a synopsis of the Pauline view of Satan and evil spirits (Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits, Rome, 1965, pp. 194ff.); also R. Leivestad, Christ the Conqueror, London, 1954, pp. 92-115; H. Schlief, Principalities and Powers in the New Testament, Freiburg, 1961, esp. pp. 44f.; G.B. Caird, Principalities and Powers, Oxford, 1956. Infra, n. 190.
188. Op. Cit., p. 373. Cp. Ign. Tral. 9.1: "...was truly crucified, while heavenly, earthly, and subterranean beings looked on". Cp. Heb. 12.22f.; Rev. 5.13.

In line iv, there is a similar ambiguity, though with only two general possibilities. ἔθνεσιν could denote either the nations in general (including Israel), or, in line with its Judaic technical meaning, the Gentiles in particular. In the latter sense, it was used collectively of those nations which stood outside the unique covenant relationship which Israel possessed as the people of God.¹⁸⁹

The solution to the question 'who' in both lines is a difficult one to answer. In order to achieve some unity of interpretation in this regard, it will be necessary to pull together all the resources of contextual analysis - immediate, historical and traditional. Of course, the immediate context is the most important, lines iii and iv being parallel to each other, and both anticipating lines v and vi. In this regard, due to the parallelism of ἁγγέλους and ἔθνεσιν, the following guideline may be suggested. If ἔθνεσιν refers in the first sense to all nations (including Israel), then ἁγγέλους should probably be thought of in terms of all supernatural beings. However, if ἔθνεσιν is limited to its Judaic technical meaning (or some similar nuance), then ἁγγέλους should probably be thought of in terms of some segment of the supernatural world, either the good angels or the 'spirit-powers'.¹⁹⁰

189. Cf. J.N.D. Kelly, *Op. Cit.*, p. 91; H. Zimmermann, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 211f. G. Bertram (TDNT, II, p. 367) makes the distinction that when ἔθνη (ἔθνος) is used in the OT to refer to Gentiles, it is referring not to a plurality of nations but to all individuals who do not belong to the chosen people.

190. The term 'spirit-powers' is being used in this thesis to represent all supernatural beings - angels, principalities, powers, etc. - apart from those good angels surrounding God's throne.

Therefore, an examination of ἐν ἑθνεσιν is in order.

R. St. J. Parry suggests that there is nothing in the form to suggest a distinction between Jew and Gentile in line iv.¹⁹¹ R.H. Gundry agrees:¹⁹²

"the antithesis ἁγγέλοις / ἑθνεσιν appears not to contrast Jews and Gentiles or angels and Gentiles, but superhuman and human beings. 'Nations' therefore is to be preferred".

In this regard, it was part of the tradition of the early church that the gospel must be preached to all nations before the final consummation (Mark 13.10; Matt. 24.14; 28.19; Apoc. 14.6). Hence the conclusion of H. Zimmermann:¹⁹³

"Es liegt jedoch nahe, daß mit ἐκπεύχων ἐν ἑθνεσιν das Universale der christlichen Botschaft ausgesprochen sein soll, so daß bei ἑθνη etwa im Sinne von Mt. 28,19 an 'alle Völker' gedacht wäre, wobei Israel ausdrücklich weder eingeschlossen noch ausgeschlossen ist".

One cannot deny the universalism of the gospel which is further emphasized in I.3.16b by the reference to its world-wide reception in line v. But there is still good reason to think that ἑθνεσιν should be limited in some way. E.G. Selwyn argues that since ἑθνεσιν (l. iv) sufficiently indicates the world, perhaps κόσμῳ (l. v) implies the whole

191. Op. Cit., p. 23.

192. Op. Cit., pp. 215f.

193. Op. Cit., p. 212. Concerning this tradition, cf. A.R.C. Leaney, The Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon (TBC), London, 1960, p. 61; also F. Gealy, Op. Cit., p. 422. Note Col. 1.23 which speaks of the hope of the gospel "which has been preached to every creature under heaven".

E. Peterson (The Angels and the Liturgy, trans. R. Walls, London, 1964, p. 50) suggests that "the angels and the entire universe take part in the Church's worship", and that "the songs of the Church are the counterparts of heavenly songs". Thus, "the angels and their song not only divide the Church into the angel-like, and the people, but they also arouse the mystical life of the Church, which can only be satisfied when men become united with the angelic choir and begin to praise God from the depths of their created being".

universe, spirits as well as men.¹⁹⁴ But this meaning of κόσμος is unlikely, especially in view of its spatial contrast with line vi limiting it to earth's sphere of existence. At most, κόσμος refers to all intelligent beings on earth who are capable of believing. Hence, if one inverts Selwyn's argument, ἐν ἔθνεσιν appears to refer to something less than all intelligent beings on earth. In this regard, it is interesting to note the grammar of the form. In the first pair of lines (i and ii), the dative nouns are singular in reference to the person of Jesus Christ. In the last pair (v and vi), the dative nouns are again singular, however used collectively of the universal acceptance and reception of Jesus Christ. Only in the middle pair are both nouns plural, suggesting perhaps the progression of the pairs - one, many, all.

Furthermore, the popular usage of the term ἔθνος in the first century and especially in the New Testament must be taken into account. It had a long history of development in which it was eventually used collectively of those who stood outside of the people of Israel. By the New Testament era, it was often used disparagingly of non-Jews as we might think of 'heathen' or 'pagans'.¹⁹⁵ These connotations are

194. Op. Cit., p. 326, n. 3.

195. For the history of the development of ἔθνος (ἔθ), see G. Bertram and K.L. Schmidt, ἔθνος, TDNT, II, pp. 364ff.; also W. Stenger, Op. Cit., pp. 40-1. For our purposes, it is helpful to note the following aspects of its development. Originally, ἔθ (ἔθνος) was used in the general sense of a group of people bound together by certain common, distinctive features such as language, customs, culture, etc. But the usage of ἔθ (pl.) changed along with the changing, historical experience of Israel in which she was eventually subdued by her enemies and her

also found in the New Testament. In the majority of occurrences (c. 100), ἔθνη is used exclusively of Gentiles. In the remaining references (c. 64) where ἔθνη is used generally of 'nations', K.L. Schmidt finds that one often has a feeling from the context that Israel is excluded.¹⁹⁶ What may be gathered from these statistics is that ἔθνη was commonly used to convey the idea of 'Gentiles' or 'heathen' or 'pagans', even in Christendom. Of particular note in this regard is its usage for pagans as distinct from Christians (I Cor. 5.1; 12.2; I Thess. 4.5; I Pet. 2.12; III John 7).

Finally, there is the consideration of the normal use of κηρύσσω in the New Testament, i.e. that it relates to salvation.¹⁹⁷ Bo Reicke observes: "As a rule κηρύσσω is

Contd.] role as the people of God became clarified in contrast to other nations. In the words of W. Stenger (p. 41): "Hier ist die Stelle, wo die Erkenntnis Jahwes als des Schöpfers der Welt und des 'Königs der Völker' (Jer 10,7) endgültig aufgeht und hier deutet Israel erneut seine Existenz und weiß sich in zurückschauender Betrachtung seiner Vergangenheit schon in Abraham (Gn 12) mit einer 'Mission' für die Völker bestimmt. Hier ist der Ansatzpunkt für den 'Missions'-Gedanken, der vorher unnatürlich gewesen wäre". Then he quotes Isa. 42.1 and 49.6. Stenger goes on to suggest that it is this idea of 'Mission' which is behind the idea in line iv - ἡ κηρύξας ἐν ἔθνεσσιν. Cf. also R. Deichgräber, Op. Cit., p. 135 and n. 5.

196. Op. Cit., pp. 369ff. Schmidt lists the following references as illustrative of the fact that Israel tends to be excluded: Rom. 15.11; Gal. 3.8; Mt. 4.15; 20.25; Acts 4.25; 7.7; 13.19; etc. Cf. pp. 370-1 for references to Gentiles.

197. E. Best (I Peter [NCB], London, 1971, p. 144) writes: "The Greek word for 'preach' is derived from the word for a herald and is normally a neutral word meaning 'proclaim publicly' without any indication of the content of what was proclaimed. This neutral meaning is occasionally retained in the NT (Rev. 5:2; cf. Lk. 12:3), but almost always it means 'preach salvation'; it is normally followed by a noun indicating what is preached, e.g. the gospel, Christ; even when it is used without any such qualification it still implies the preaching of salvation (Mk. 1:38; 3:14; Mt. 11:1; Rom. 10:14; I Cor. 1:21; 9:27)". Cf. R.H. Mounce, The Essential Nature of New Testament Preaching, Grand Rapids, 1960.

the special term for preaching the Gospel".¹⁹⁸ There is no reason to exclude this sense from line iv, especially in view of the response of belief indicated in line v. With this in mind, ἐν ἑθνεσιν may be used to refer to those outside the fellowship of Christ, those to whom the gospel is preached for the purpose of eliciting belief. In this case, ἑθνεσιν retains its common, technical sense of 'heathen', but does so in a way which is not limited merely to the 'Gentile' populace. For from the viewpoint of the Christian, the 'heathen' included unbelieving Gentiles and Jews alike.¹⁹⁹

Just as the proclamation in line iv is limited to those outside Christendom, the appearance in line iii probably should refer to those angels not in the court of Yahweh. Of course, there is the possibility that lines iii and iv contrast those beings nearest to God (unfallen angels) with those beings farthest from his presence (heathen):²⁰⁰

- a) "Die Verkündigung an die heidnischen Völker geht also parallel dem Vorgang im Himmel, in dem der Erhöhte den Engeln des himmlischen Hofstaates geoffenbart wird".
 b) "In dem ἐκπύρω ἐν ἑθνεσιν steht ἐν ἑθνεσιν dem ἐκπύρω gegenüber: überall wurde Christus als Gottmensch und Erlöser erkannt, sowohl von den höchsten Creaturen, den Engeln, als auch von den niedrigsten, den Heiden".

198. Disobedient Spirits, p. 129.

199. It may be that the term ἑθνος is used for the very purpose of emphasizing the universalism of the gospel against the exclusivism of the Judaists, as E.G. Hinson (1-2 Timothy and Titus (BBC, 11), London, 1972, p. 322; also C.K. Barrett, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 65) would suggest. The gospel was proclaimed not only among the Jews to whom it was first manifested, but also among the Gentiles (an allusion to the work of Paul here perhaps being implied).

200. a) W. Stenger, Op. Cit., p. 41; b) A. Bisping, Erklärung der drei Pastoralbriefe und des Briefes an Philemon, Münster, 1865, p. 186; cf. also J.H. Bernard, Op. Cit., p. 63; R. Jamieson, A.R. Fausset, and D. Brown, A Commentary, Critical, Experimental, and Practical, on the Old and New Testaments, VI, Glasgow, 1870, p. 412.

But it is more likely that ἄγγελοι generally refers to those angels, principalities and powers in heaven, who, like those on earth to whom Christ is proclaimed, need to recognize that God has vindicated his son and made him Lord of glory (κύριος τῆς δόξης).²⁰¹

This view is unacceptable to W. Stenger, who regards ἄγγελοι as referring to the angels surrounding God's throne in heaven. He pictures Christ as appearing before them to receive their homage and perhaps to confirm his higher position over them (Heb. 1.4-14).²⁰² But what would be the point of including such a presentation in this form? These good angels accepted without question his superiority and needed not to be convinced to worship him. They were at one with the purposes of God with reference to Jesus Christ and were aware of what had taken place on earth. For they heralded his coming, were present at significant events during his life, and even clarified the resurrection to the women at the tomb and the ascension to the multitude who were left looking up into heaven.²⁰³ In contrast, there are those

201. C.J. Ellicott (A Critical and Grammatical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, London, 1856, p. 53) opposes any reference to evil angels here on the ground of the parallelism of angels/nations. But R.H. Gundry (Op. Cit., p. 215) rightly observes that "if the nations to whom proclamation is made are non-Christian, why may not the angels to whom Christ appears be hostile?"

Note also the discussion by H. Swanston (The Community Witness, London, 1967, pp. 193f.) concerning the mention of angels in the primitive liturgy. He concludes that this imagery is regularly used to refer to "the enemy angels of gnostic and hellenistic belief".

202. Op. Cit., pp. 39f. E.F. Scott (Op. Cit., p. 41) notes that the idea of the Messiah being worshipped by angels is present in several Jewish Apocalypses, and in the NT (notably Rev. 5.11-13).

203. Note the references and discussion found in TDNT, I, p. 84, the article on ἄγγελοι by G. Kittel.

angels (and principalities and powers and authorities, etc.) for whom the presentation of the 'vindicated' Christ would have revolutionary effect. Note the following emphasis in Paul:

Christ has "disarmed the principalities and authorities ...triumphing over them in it (Col. 2.15); he has been exalted "far above every principality and authority and power and lordship" (Eph. 1.21). At present, however, Christ is at work reducing to impotence "every principality and every authority and power...for, he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet" (I Cor. 15.24f.). Hence, "the rulers of this age who are being reduced to impotence" (I Cor. 2.6f.) can be described as "weak and beggarly elemental spirits" (Gal. 4.9). The purpose of God in all this is "that to the principalities and authorities in the heavenly places there might now be made known through the church the manifold wisdom of God" (Eph. 3.10) and that He might "sum up all things in Christ" (Eph. 1.10).²⁰⁴

It is the same conviction which enters into the conclusion of other hymnic and/or confessional material (Phil. 2.10f.; Col. 1.15-20; 2.15; I Pet. 3.18ff.; also Pol. Phil. 2.1; Ign. Tral. 9.1; Ign. Eph. 19.1), and is expressed in the Christological use of Psalm 110 in the New Testament.²⁰⁵

204. This listing (its order and selection) is dependent upon G.B. Caird, Op. Cit., 1956, pp. 81f. Note also the following references in their contexts: Gal. 4.3-9; Eph. 4.8-10; 6.12; Col. 2.8-18; Rev. 5.13. On the triumph of Christ over the powers, see the following: R. Bultmann, "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief", Coniectanea Neotestamentica XI, Lund-Copenhagen, 1947, pp. 6-9; D.E.H. Whiteley, Op. Cit., pp. 19ff.; R. Leivestad, Op. Cit., pp. 92ff.; L. Cerfaux, Op. Cit., note references under 'Powers' in the subject index; W. Manson, Jesus and the Christian, London, 1967, pp. 76ff.; H. Schlier, Op. Cit., esp. pp. 44ff.; W. Grundmann, "Αἰώνις", TDNT, II, pp. 307ff.

205. O. Cullmann (The Earliest Christian Confessions, trans. J.K.S. Reid, London, 1949, p. 59) agrees: "It is the same conviction which in another connection is expressed in the Christological interpretation of Psalm 110, where it is proclaimed that the King will sit at the right hand of God, and 'all enemies' will be conquered and subjected to Him. These 'enemies' are identified in the Christian

[Contd.]

In the words of T.W. Manson:²⁰⁶

"What seems to be implied in all this is that in the present age the spiritual beings - angels, principalities, powers - are not so much thought of as servants of God; rather as independent ruling powers, who for the time being, at any rate, exercise lordship over the world...Apart from Christ the whole world and all mankind are under the domination of these supernatural beings; and one of the great tasks of Christ is to overcome them and deprive them of their power, put them under his feet".

In this regard, it is also interesting to note the change in Paul's (or his successor's) attitude towards these powers which he underwent in the course of his missionary work:²⁰⁷

"In his earlier letters he speaks only of the defeat of the powers, and if he looks at all beyond defeat it is to their destruction; but in his imprisonment epistles he looks beyond defeat to their reconciliation to God".

No longer is it a question of their annihilation but of their subjection; and this idea is consistent with the parallelism of lines iii and ivff. Whereas the gospel is proclaimed to those outside the circle of believers with the result that the whole world believes, so also the 'vindicated' Christ appears before those 'spirit-powers' not surrounding God's throne with the ultimate result that all supernatural beings

Contd.] scheme (I Cor. 15.25; Eph. 1.21f.; Heb. 10.13; I Pet. 3.22; Acts 2.34; Mt. 22.44; Mk. 12.30; Lk. 20.42; I Clem. 36.5; Barn. 12.10) with the invisible powers, and regarded as earlier rulers of the world. Their subjection marks the victory already accomplished through the death and resurrection of Christ, and also the real beginning of the reign of Christ....yet the invisible powers, which are only bound and subject to Christ, must be again and finally vanquished, in order to pass at the end of time to their appointed annihilation". Infra, n. 223.

206. Op. Cit., p. 21. Manson also observed that in general, Paul's treatment of good angels is somewhat of a rarity.

207. G.B. Caird, Op. Cit., p. 81. Cf. also L. Cerfaux, Op. Cit., pp. 99f.; F. Amiot, The Key Concepts of St. Paul, trans. J. Dingle, London, 1962, p. 188, n. 8.

acknowledge him as Lord as he is received up in glory.

The description of this segment of angeldom as 'spirit-powers' should not be made more precise. R.H. Gundry relates them to the "spirits in prison" of I Pet. 3.18ff.;²⁰⁸ B.S. Easton regards them as angels in an 'intermediate position' between the angels of the Lord and demons;²⁰⁹ and G. Holtz has no hesitation in calling them 'Dämonen'.²¹⁰ But since there is a lack of precision in the text, it is enough to understand ἀγγέλους as referring generally to that group of angels ultimately brought under subjection.²¹¹

In conclusion, both lines relate not to specific events, but to the fact that Christ was presented before those in heaven and on earth who had not yet acknowledged him as Lord. In the words of L. Cerfaux:²¹²

"Christ compels recognition where the Jewish religion had not succeeded - in the world of the gentiles and against the opposition of the heavenly Powers".

Or, from the present perspective in time, it may be thought of in this way. Christ as King is now active in both heaven and earth setting up his reign; and the Christian has such confidence in this that he can speak of it in terms of the aorist tense.

208. Op. Cit., p. 215.

209. Op. Cit., p. 137.

210. Op. Cit., p. 92.

211. Cf. G. Gealy, Op. Cit., p. 422. R.H. Fuller (Op. Cit., p. 218) refers to them as 'cosmic powers'.

212. Op. Cit., p. 374.

3. Ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ, ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ:

The result of Christ's presentation before both the spirit-world and the nations is his ultimate reception in both realms of existence. He 'was believed on in the world' and 'was taken up in glory'. But there remains some ambiguity as to the meaning of these last two phrases of the form.

In line v, there are two possible ways to understand ἐν κόσμῳ. It may refer to 'the theatre of human life and history', or in the narrower sense to 'the theatre of salvation history' (mankind). In other words, it may refer to the 'inhabited world' (earth), or only to 'humanity' which inhabits the earth.²¹³ From the context of the form, it is apparent that both nuances could be present. For Ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ denotes by antithetical parallelism with ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ a contrast of two realms of existence, thereby suggesting more the idea of the 'inhabited world' or 'earth'. But Ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ also stands in synthetical parallelism to Ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν, and the proclamation of the gospel which results in faith in the hearers points to the narrower sense of κόσμος, 'mankind'.²¹⁴ For 'belief' is a phenomenon which only intelligent beings on earth experience. Therefore, the narrower sense of 'mankind' is probably the

213. Κόσμος also has a wider connotation in the NT, that of the Universe, the sum of all created being (as in Acts 17.24). But this connotation is not an option in line v, because of the spatial contrast throughout the hymn. Moreover, its contrast with line vi restricts κόσμῳ to this world, despite Selwyn's argument to the contrary (*supra*, pp.153f.). For the use of κόσμος in the NT, cf. H. Sasse; "κόσμος", TDNT, III, pp. 868ff.

214. Cf. R.H. Gundry, *Op. Cit.*, p. 216.

prominent sense of ἐν κόσμῳ, although there may be 'over-tones of meaning' with reference to the response of all God's creation here on earth. In the words of W. Stenger:²¹⁵

"...als die geschaffene Welt oder die Menschenwelt,... 'Kosmos' vielleicht ueber die Menschenwelt hinaus das Gesamt der Schoepfung Gottes bezeichnet".

This emphasis on the narrower, personal sense of κόσμος rather than on its broader usage does not mean that spatial connotations are absent from the line. Belief among mankind takes place in this realm of existence, even as Christ's reception by the spirit-world takes place in another realm, that characterized by δόξα. This contrast of spheres is accentuated by the use of the verb ἐνελημφθη and the progression of thought - "...in the world, taken up...".²¹⁶

But what does this understanding of ἐν κόσμῳ do to the interpretation of ἐν δόξῃ in line vi? Since the prominent meaning of ἐν κόσμῳ is 'mankind', parallelism would indicate that ἐν δόξῃ denotes something of the spirit-world which receives him in heaven. But δόξα is seldom used directly of beings in heaven other than God; and when it is so used, it is only as they are associated with the presence of God.²¹⁷ What, then, is being conveyed by this phrase?

215. Op. Cit., p. 43.

216. Cf. R.H. Gundry, Op. Cit., p. 218. Concerning both the synthetic and antithetic parallelism involved here, Gundry (p. 216) writes: "'Believed on in [the] world' (line 5) denotes by synthetic parallelism the result of 'preached among nations' (line 4) and by antithetic parallelism with 'taken up in glory' (line 6) a contrast in the two spheres of Christ's reception, the world and (by implication from 'taken up') heaven".

217. Note the paragraph by Kittel ("δόξα", TDNT, II, p. 251) with reference to "The δόξα of the Angels".

G. Kittel observes:²¹⁸

"In the NT...the word is used for the most part in a sense for which there is no Greek analogy whatever and of which there is only an isolated example in Philo. That is to say, it denotes 'divine and heavenly radiance', the 'loftiness and majesty' of God, and even the 'being of God' and His world".

It is probable, therefore, that the answer to this question is to be found in the Hebraic understanding of דֹּכָא (דִּיכָא).

In the Old Testament, 'glory' belongs first and foremost to God. Whether the concept is used of God's self-manifestation to man, of the 'glory' which will someday fill the whole earth,²¹⁹ or of the highest heavenly regions in contrast to the 'firmament' which is part of creation (Ps. 19.1), it is characteristic of God's presence and, as Jeremiah notes, of his throne (14.21; 17.12). This basic idea of the דִּיכָא was retained in the LXX and New Testament, though it appears to have acquired a more substantial sense with reference to the essence or nature of God:²²⁰

"...(דֹּכָא) may simply refer to 'God's honour' or 'power', like דִּיכָא ...[But] in reality, the term always speaks of one thing. God's power is an expression of the 'divine nature', and the honour ascribed to God by man is finally no other than an affirmation of this nature... In the LXX and therefore in the Bible generally דֹּכָא acquires its distinctive sense as a term for this divine nature or essence either in its invisible or its perceptible form".

Hence, J.N.D. Kelly is prepared to refer to דֹּכָא as the terminus technicus "for the dazzling brightness with which God's

218. Ibid., p. 237.

219. Num. 14.21; Ps. 57.5, 11; 72.19; cf. Isa. 6.3.

220. G. Kittel, Op. Cit., p. 244.

presence is encompassed".²²¹

In this light, ἐν δόξῃ no doubt refers to the immediate presence of God to which Christ has been exalted. He now shares in the glory of God; God's glory belongs essentially to Christ.²²² This idea is also suggested by the verb ἀνελήμφθη. For if ἀνα- is given due expression in English, then Christ is not just raised to heaven, as if that were enough. He is raised to 'high heaven' (NEB), so that he is above all things (Phil. 2.9; Col. 1.15, 18), even at the right hand of God (Mark 16.19; Acts 2.33; Rom. 8.34; Col. 3.1; Heb. 1.3).

How, then, can ἐν δόξῃ denote something of the spirit-world which receives him in heaven? This is intimated in two ways. First, in the light of the synthetic parallelism of ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ (l. vi) to ἕφθη ἀγγέλοις (l. iii), Christ's exaltation to this supreme position is evidence of his triumph. He is now Lord (Phil. 2.10f.), exalted at the right hand of God with all his enemies (the 'spirit-powers') in subjection to him.²²³ His appearance in line iii was the

221. Op. Cit., pp. 91f. This synopsis is largely dependent upon G. von Rad's and G. Kittel's discussions of δόξα in TDNT, II, pp. 233ff.

222. Elsewhere in the NT, when δόξα is mentioned in connection with Christ's resurrection (Rom. 6.4; I Pet. 1.11, 21; Acts 7.55; II Cor. 3.18), the implication is given that the risen Christ shares henceforth in the glory that belongs essentially to his Father. Note also the following references in which δόξα is attributed to Christ: I Cor. 2.8; Heb. 13.21; I Pet. 4.11ff.; Apoc. 5.12f.

223. See the discussion above of Psalm 110, n. 205. C.H. Dodd supposes that wherever the exaltation of Christ or the subjection of hostile powers to him was mentioned, the ultimate reference was to Psalm 110.1, an OT verse "deeply rooted in the kerygma" (The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development, London, 1963, p. 15). Cf. J. Kremer, "Aufgenommen in Herrlichkeit", Bibel und Kirche, 20/2 (1965) p. 34.

prelude to his reception in line vi. Second, Christ's reception ἐν δόξῃ (l. vi) stands parallel to his reception ἐν κόσμῳ (l. v) where through faith he has become Lord in the hearts of all mankind. Just as ἐν κόσμῳ primarily refers not to the earth but to its inhabitants, so also ἐν δόξῃ primarily refers not to the essence of God's presence but to the entire supernatural world surrounding God's throne in worship and submission.

But there remains one further difficulty. For this interpretation assumes that ἐν δόξῃ pertains not so much to Christ's movement into glory as to his being in glory. However, when ἀναλαμβάνω is used of Christ in the New Testament, it appears to be a terminus technicus for his ascension into heaven (Mk. 16.19; Acts 1.2, 11, 22).²²⁴ W. Stenger also observes that ἀναλαμβάνω is used in the LXX of the rapture of Elijah, and suggests that its meaning is two-fold: "einmal die Ent-rückung von der Erde und zum anderen die Aufnahme in den Himmel".²²⁵ Hence, one might suppose that ἐν is tinged

224. Cf. G. Delling, "ἀναλαμβάνω", TDNT, IV, pp. 7f.; also J. Schneider, "ἀναβαίνω", TDNT, I, pp. 520f. The cognate ἀνάληψις occurs only in Lk. 9.51 where it appears to have a wider reference to "the whole Passion-history conceived as a transition from the earthly to the heavenly life" (W. Manson, The Gospel of Luke, London, 1963, p. 120). According to J.M. Creed (The Gospel According to St. Luke, London, 1957, p. 141); "Here the term perhaps connotes the various stages by which Jesus passed from an earthly to a heavenly existence (cf. ἔξοδος v. 31 supra) rather than the single incident of the Ascension into heaven".

225. Op. Cit., p. 43. He also writes: "Das Wort kehrt wieder, wenn in I Makk 2,58 von Elias gesagt wird: 'In Seinem großen Eifer für das Gesetz ward Elias in den Himmel erhoben'. Sir 48,10 gebraucht es von Elias und Sir 49.14 von Entrückung des Henoch von der Erde".

with the meaning of εἰς (into) so that the phrase would imply both his ascension 'into' glory and his exalted position 'in' glory.

R.H. Gundry, however, notes the difficulty of this view:²²⁶

"ἐν in the sense of εἰς is unusual. That sense would deviate from the usage of ἐν in the parallel lines, and the consistency with which ἐν δόξῃ elsewhere denotes accompanying circumstance favors that meaning here - all to the exclusion of the sense 'into glory'."

His solution to this problem is to regard δόξῃ as a condition, the 'shekinah-cloud', rather than a place, heaven. Therefore, Christ ascended in "the accompanying circumstance of the shekinah-cloud" of Acts 1.9.²²⁷ But this explanation is unsatisfactory for several reasons. First, it is doubtful whether the cloud of Acts 1.9 should be referred to as a 'shekinah-cloud', which in the Old Testament was a sign of the presence of God. There is no indication in Acts that such a connotation was meant. Moreover, the cloud in the Old Testament referred not so much to God's 'glory' as to the 'covering' of his glory. Second, from its context in the form, it is more natural to think of ἐν δόξῃ in terms of Christ being 'in the presence of God' rather than 'in the cloud' during his ascension. Together with line iii,

ἀνελημφθῆ ἐν δόξῃ should be viewed completely as an event of

226. Op. Cit., p. 216. Also note that εἰς, not ἐν, is used with ἀνελαμβάνω of the ascension into heaven in Mk. 16. 19 and Acts 1.11. Of course, this is not to suggest that ἐν δόξῃ could not be understood as εἰς δόξαν. (For the use of ἐν for εἰς, cf. N. Turner, Op. Cit., pp. 254ff., esp. 257f.) The present writer wants only to recommend that the interpretation 'in' be preserved in view of the general symmetry of the form and the ensuing arguments.

227. Ibid., p. 216, n. 6, and p. 217.

the heavenly world, Christ having already appeared in the realm of angelic powers. Thus, in contrast to ἐπιστεύθη ἐν ὄψεσιν, the phrase should have nothing to do with an event which occurred in this realm of existence before the eyes of the disciples. Instead, it continues the line of thought that the One who was presented before the 'spirit-powers' is now received in triumph at the right hand of God, parallel to the fact that he has been received by faith in the world. Otherwise, there would be no logical (or chronological) order to the form. Moreover, 'in a cloud' simply does not form an adequate contrast to 'in the world' (line v).

R. Deichgräber argues that the form does not need to be in chronological order, and that the reason why line vi appears at the end of the form is two-fold: first, one must allow for the poetic freedom of the author who no doubt thought that reference to Christ's ascension ἐν δόξῃ was a more suitable ending than line v. Second, I.3.16b was patterned after a scheme (an ancient Egyptian coronation ceremony) in which 'enthronement' (ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ) came last in the order.²²⁸ But his two-fold explanation is not convincing. It is by no means certain, or even probable, that I.3.16b is patterned after an Egyptian coronation ceremony.²²⁹ Furthermore, to refer simply to 'poetic license' is not a strong argument. It would appear that Deichgräber begins by assuming that line vi refers to the ascension, and his two-fold reason is an attempt to explain why line vi must therefore

228. Op. Cit., p. 136.

229. Supra, pp. 49ff.; infra, Chap. III, Sec. B.1.

be out of chronological order.

But is it necessary to find reference to Christ's ascension in line vi? Does the aorist ἀνελήμφθη necessarily refer to some specific event, whether it be his ascension, or his going up 'in the shekinah cloud', or his 'enthronement' in heaven?²³⁰ At this point, it is preferable to view line vi in its context, especially in relation to line v. In the latter line, ἐπιστεύθη cannot refer to a specific event in time since the acceptance of Christ in faith is a present, continuing experience of the Church. Therefore, ἐπιστεύθη should be viewed in one of the following ways. The term may be used here as a 'complexive' aorist in which the totality of belief is viewed as completed from the perspective of the Parousia. It may be thought of as a 'gnomic' aorist in which case the author means to convey the general axiom that the whole world will, indeed must, respond to Christ in faith. Or it may be viewed as a combination of these two senses. Similarly, in line vi, ἀνελήμφθη may be viewed as a 'complexive' aorist, keeping the entire expanse of time from his resurrection/ascension to the Endzeit in mind. It may be a 'gnomic' aorist conveying the accepted belief that Christ has been placed far above all angels, principalities and powers. Or it may be a combination of these two senses.

230. E.F. Scott (Op. Cit., p. 42) proposes that line vi refers not to the ascension (into glory) but to the time of the final consummation 'after the harvest is fully gathered in' (line v), when Christ 'will enter on His eternal Kingdom with His whole work gloriously accomplished'. But the author does not have a chronological order of events in view here. Line vi is not to be placed after line v, but parallel to line v. As Christ was received on earth, so he triumphed in heaven.

This would appear to be the solution to the interpretation of ἀνελγύμφοι ἐν. Not only does this view consider the parallelism of ἀνελγύμφοι (vi) and ἐπιστεύθη (v), but it is also consistent with the interpretations suggested above for the aorists in lines i - iv. Therefore, the author is not trying to emphasize in line vi any specific event in the life of Christ. He is simply concerned to convey the general truth that Christ has been glorified and enthroned, "that he has been taken up into the realm of divine glory, there to reign with the Father".²³¹

In conclusion, ἐν δόξῃ refers to the 'majesty' and 'radiance' which Christ now shares with God; and ἀνελγύμφοι refers to Christ's elevation to this position. But it is not just a statement concerning the nature of his person. The phrase denotes Christ's ascendance over all the angelic hosts, good and bad alike. This triumph in the heavenly realm parallels his reception through faith in the world. The contrast is both spatial (heaven and earth) and personal (God with all angels and all mankind). Together the last two lines sing of his universal enthronement as Lord both in the hearts of all mankind and over all supernatural beings.

C. Conclusion:

The purpose of this linguistic analysis has been to ascertain the meaning of the words and phrases in I.3.16b. But this has not been an easy assignment. For, on the one

231. J.N.D. Kelly, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 92.

hand, it is clear that song and verse are not necessarily characterized by precision of thought; and precision of form may be attributed to poetic artistry rather than to the nature of the content. But, on the other hand, some sense was intended; and there is reason to suppose that the careful thought which apparently went into the creation of the form did not stop short of the content. Hence, while there is no room for dogmatism, some opinion should be ventured.

The method which was used for this purpose was 'contextual analysis'. The words and phrases of I.3.16b were examined in the light of their immediate, historical and traditional contexts. Of particular note was the attempt to interpret the lines as couplets rather than as individual units. Perhaps in the mind of the reader, this parallelism played too large a role in their interpretation. But it was felt that this approach is to be preferred to that which examines the lines separately and therefore with too limited an immediate context.²³²

This analysis has also been at a disadvantage in that there is little agreement among scholars as to the background of the form. It is very important for words and phrases to be analyzed in relation to the historical situation being addressed. However, some light on the background has been

232. Supra, pp. 80ff. It may be questioned whether it is right to use the results of the analysis of form in this way, since it is evident that at so many points the form of I.3.16b depends on the meaning of the phrases involved. But the analysis must begin somewhere; and since the acceptance of the parallelism of lines i/ii, iii/iv, v/vi is conceded by most scholars today and seemed most probable in the analysis of form above, it has been used to help enlarge the immediate context of the words and phrases.

forthcoming in the above analysis; and it is hoped that whatever remains in question due to the lack of a prior historical inquiry will be clarified in the ensuing analysis of the historical background (Chap. III).

1. Basic meaning of lines i - vi:

The conclusions of this analysis may be summarized as follows. Whereas line i speaks of the appearance of the 'pre-existent One' as a human being in this realm of existence, line ii relates to his consequent vindication by God in the realm of spirit (or in his resurrected/exalted form of existence). Lines iii and iv refer to Christ's 'presentation' in both realms (heaven/earth) before those who had not yet acknowledged him as Lord - those 'spirit-powers' outside the circle of faithful angels surrounding God's throne to whom he appeared, and those men outside the circle of believers to whom he was proclaimed. The result of this 'presentation' is his 'reception' both on earth in the hearts of all mankind through faith (l. v), and in heaven by all supernatural beings through his triumphant elevation to share in the glory of God (l. vi).

Involved in this interaction of ideas is an interesting combination of both spatial and personal nuances. On the one hand, Ev plus the dative appears to be used as a locative contrasting two realms of existence, the human and the divine, earth and heaven: viz. Jesus' flesh, nations (men) and world (all mankind) relate to the human realm of existence (ll. i, iv, v), while spirit (Christ's resurrected/exalted existence), angels and glory (the entire supernatural world) relate to the

divine realm of existence (ll. ii, iii, vi). On the other hand, these spatial categories are tempered by personal nuances. Note the steady progression from one to many to all in the three couplets: Jesus' incarnate existence stands parallel to his resurrection existence; those 'spirit-powers' outside the circle of faithful angels stand parallel to those men outside the circle of believers; and all mankind stands parallel to the entire supernatural world. Hence, there is in the form both an antithetical parallelism and a cumulative parallelism side by side.

It has also been suggested that the lines do not point to any specific events in the life of Christ. For lines iv and v appear to represent not just one point of time in history, but an extension of time from the beginning of the proclamation to that day of universal belief. Also, the remaining four lines evade every attempt to attach them to specific events in his life, whether his birth, incarnation, death, resurrection and appearances, ascension or parousia. Instead, they convey in general terms the 'consequence' of Christ's life in both realms of existence. The aorist tense is used in its 'complexive' and/or 'perfective' and/or 'gnomic' sense in which the redemptive significance of Christ's person and work comes to the fore. They may be viewed as axioms, timeless and self-evident.²³³

2. Overtones of meaning:

Because of the passage's character as a 'Bekenntnislied'

233. For a summary concerning the use of the aorist tense, infra, pp. 274ff.

written from a standpoint of faith, it is to be expected that there are probably 'overtones of meaning' present in the lines.²³⁴ To detect such 'overtones of meaning' is largely a subjective enterprise, dependent upon the one who is reciting the form. For this reason, discussion in this area will be limited in length and detail. But it will be beneficial to consider some of the 'overtones' which may have been present in the first century.

In the introduction above, N.W. Porteous was quoted as writing:²³⁵

"...in the course of their usage certain words became so loaded with theological meaning that a hearer or reader of utterances or passages in which these words occurred would often catch, and was perhaps intended to catch, overtones of meaning. Much of the beauty and significance of poetry depends on the suggestiveness of the words employed..."

With this in mind, some of the vocabulary in the form may be reviewed.

First, there are those terms chosen by the author which relate to the human realm of existence: σάρξ, ἔθνος and κόσμος. Σάρξ, though not synonymous with evil nor the source of evil, is often closely related in the New Testament to all that pertains to the old aeon -- to circumcision, to the law, to lust and sin and weakness and death.²³⁶ However, God used σάρξ which, through the law, has the ability to lead

234. Supra, pp. 76ff.

235. Supra, pp. 76f.

236. For this use of σάρξ, consult such works as the following: R. Jewett, Paul's Anthropological Terms; J.A.T. Robinson, The Body; W.D. Stacey, The Pauline View of Man, London, 1956; E. Schweizer, "σάρξ", TDNT, VII.

man to sin and death, as a means to save man by sending his Son "in the likeness of sinful flesh..(to condemn)..sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8.3):

- I Pet. 3.18; 4.1 - It was "in the flesh" that Christ "suffered" and was "put to death" in order that he "might bring us to God". (Cf. Heb. 10.20)
- Heb. 2.14f. - Jesus "likewise partook" of "flesh and blood"²³⁷ that "through death he might destroy him who has the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver all those who through fear of death were subject to lifelong bondage".
- Heb. 5.7f. - "In the days of his flesh", Jesus "learned obedience through what he suffered", thus becoming "the source of eternal salvation to all who obey him..."
- Eph. 2.14f. - Christ has brought both circumcised and uncircumcised together "by abolishing in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances", consequently creating a situation in which he "might reconcile...both to God in one body through the cross..." (Cf. 5.31)
- Col. 1.21f. - Christ "has now reconciled in his body of flesh by his death" those (Gentiles) who once were estranged to God.

In these passages, σάρξ not only refers to the humanity of Jesus, to the fact that he lived in the realm of human existence, but also to that realm characterized by the categories of law and sin and death; viz., σάρξ refers to that realm which is separated from God and is in need of redemption.

These same connotations are often present in the use of ἔθνος and κόσμος in the New Testament. When ἔθνος is used in its technical sense (as it is in I.3.16b²³⁸), it refers to that sector of humanity which is separated from the people of God and therefore stands in deep need of redemption. Likewise, the κόσμος is estranged from its Creator and has fallen victim to divine judgment.²³⁹ Because of the frequency of

237. The proper order in the Greek is σύνεσθαι καὶ σαρκεῖν.

238. Supra, p. 156; cf. pp. 152ff.

239. Cf. H. Sasse, Op. Cit., esp. p. 892.

this usage, J. Parry writes:²⁴⁰

"There may be a suggestion in both ἐξέσθιν and κόσμου of the remoteness from God of the spheres in which this proclamation was made and accepted..."

Indeed, it is questionable whether it was at all possible for those Christians in the first century to recite these three words without bringing to mind some of these theological connotations with reference to estrangement from God and the need of mankind for redemption.

Second, there is the contrast of σάρξ and πνεῦμα in lines i and ii of I.3.16b. This contrast brings to mind two other traditional forms in the New Testament, Romans 1.3f. and I Pet. 3.18ff. In both passages, σάρξ and πνεῦμα are contrasted with the latter term relating specifically to Christ's resurrection. In Rom. 1.3f. it is a contrast between Jesus' birth and resurrection, and in I Pet. 3.18ff. between his death and resurrection. The juxtaposition of Jesus' death to his resurrection is found in the kerygma in Acts (2.23ff.; 3.15; 4.10; 5.30f.; 10.39f.; 13.29f.; 17.3) as well as in theological (some confessional) passages throughout the New Testament (Rom. 4.24f.; 8.34; 10.9; 14.9; I Cor. 15.3f.; II Cor. 5.15; Eph. 1.20; Col. 1.18; I Th. 4.14; II Tim. 2.8, 11f.; I Pet. 1.3, 21; 3.18).²⁴¹ Hence, there is little doubt but that 'overtones of meaning' with reference to Christ's death and resurrection were brought to mind in the recitation of this form.

240. Op. Cit., p. 23.

241. Note also the following passages which closely relate to this dual theme of death/resurrection: Phil. 2.8-9; Col. 2.15; II Tim. 1.10; Tit. 2.13f.; Heb. 1.3.; 2.9f.; I Pet. 2.23f.

But more than this, there was probably also reflection on the unique nature and value of the manifestation and death of Christ. It was a basic conviction of the early Church that Christ died for us and for our sins. Note the widespread familiarity with this central Christian dogma, the following references being only a sample of those present in the New Testament:²⁴²

- I Jn. 3.5 - "You know that he appeared (ἐφανερώθη) to take away sins..."
 I Jn. 3.8 - "The reason the Son of God appeared (ἐφανερώθη) was to destroy the works of the devil..."
 Heb. 9.26 - Christ "has appeared (πεφανερώται)...to put away sin".
 I Pet. 1.20 - Christ "was made manifest (φανερωθέντος) at the end of the times for your sake..."
 I Cor. 15.3 - "Christ died for our sins..."
 Rom. 6.10 - "The death he died he died to sin, once for all..."
 Gal. 1.4 - "Who gave himself for our sins..."
 I Tim. 1.15 - "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners..."
 I Tim. 2.6 - "Who gave himself a ransom for all..."
 Tit. 2.14 - "Who gave himself for us to redeem us from all iniquity".

One is also encouraged to think along these lines because of the presence of ἐδικαιώθη in line ii. As we have indicated above,²⁴³ other verbs could have been used to convey the idea of 'vindication'; but δικαίω was the verb chosen which in the Pauline Corpus is mainly used in relation to 'justification by faith'. Thus, there is the progression of thought in Rom. 4.25: "who was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification"; and in I Pet. 3.18abc: "Christ

242. Cf. also Jn. 1.29; 10.11; Rom. 5.6-8; 8.3f.; 14.9; I Cor. 5.7; 8.11; II Cor. 5.14f.; 8.9; Gal. 2.20f.; 3.13; 4.4f.; Eph. 2.14f.; 5.2; Col. 1.20-22; I Thess. 5.10; Heb. 2.9, 14f.; 10.12ff.; I Pet. 1.18-21; 2.21ff.; I Jn. 3.16; Apoc. 1.5; 5.9.

243. Supra, p. 116.

suffered once for sins, the just for the unjust, in order that he might bring us to God".²⁴⁴

244. Note also the progression of thought in Rom. 8.3ff. and Gal. 4.4f.

This reflection on 'justification by faith' was not just a "Pauline peculium" (A.M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, London, 1961, p. 32), but was characteristic of the early Church as a whole. It is true that the great majority of the uses of δικαιόω in this sense occurs in Romans (15) and Galatians (8). But Hunter continues: "It is agreed that in Romans Paul often appeals to Christian beliefs shared in common by the Roman church and himself. Must not the doctrine of 'justification by faith' which bulks so large in this epistle have been familiar to them? ... In Gal. 2.16 Paul can appeal to Peter on this very ground. 'Knowing that a man cannot be justified by the works of the law, but only through faith in Jesus...'" Hunter quotes J. Weiss (The History of Primitive Christianity, London, 1937, p. 231) as writing: "One always comes back to the theory that these well-known controversial conceptions were not first created by Paul". Also G. Dix (Jew and Greek, London, 1953, p. 45): "This is not a Pauline discovery". Note the discussions in A. Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, pp. 232-3; W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 222.

The point is, that this doctrine was familiar throughout the early Church and, therefore, could have been brought to mind as well in the recital of the form. Of course, it is not likely that all the implications of this doctrine were brought to mind all at one time, but rather the idea that Christ as the 'Just One' was "raised for our justification". This could easily have been brought to mind. G. Schrenk (Op. Cit., p. 61) states that the ground of the believer's justification is "God's justifying action in the death and resurrection of Christ". For that matter, the human life of Jesus was an important factor as well, as T.W. Manson (On Paul and John, pp. 60-2) notes: "For Paul, the fact of Christ's human life, life lived under the same conditions as ours, and subject to the same limitations, exposed to the same temptations, constitutes an invasion of the territory of sin by God. The whole life of Jesus is a constant warfare without and within against all the forces of evil in the world. In all this they could not get the better of him. 'He was obedient'. 'He knew no sin'. That is to say, he was in the position -- which no other person in history, in Paul's view, ever held -- of being justified by works. Of him the saying (Gal. 3.12 = Lev. 18.5) ought to have held: 'He who does them shall live by them'... By the law, therefore, he should have been declared righteous. In fact, he was condemned, and brought under the curse of the law -- unjustly. Who is responsible for the unjust condemnation of the righteous one?..... It was sin that compassed the condemnation of Jesus..... God allowed Christ to become

[Contd.]

In the light of these considerations, it would be prejudiced not to suppose that some 'overtones of meaning' along these lines were caught by the worshipping community. But it is another question whether such overtones of meaning were originally intended by the author of the form. It might be supposed from its context in I Timothy that the answer is in the affirmative. For I.3.16b stands in apposition to "the mystery of godliness", exemplifying the source of 'godly living' which has just been recommended to the leaders of the Church;²⁴⁵ but the form as it stands, without some overtones with reference to Christ's victory over sin, etc., would not serve the purpose for which it was intended. Nevertheless, while the possibility is there, it cannot be assumed that these overtones were originally intended by the author. The conclusions of a critical study cannot be based on 'overtones of meaning', no matter how probable they might be. Therefore, it is only with the 'basic meaning' of the lines in view that the ensuing analysis of the form's historical background should be approached.

Contd.] Sin's victim -- allowed him to be treated as sinful, that thereby the power of sin might be destroyed and men be enabled to become righteous in the new sense. Paul's emphasis on the Resurrection then falls naturally into its proper place. It is God's reversal of Sin's condemnation. Sin crucified Christ: God raised him". This is an excellent summary of the significance of Christ's life, death and resurrection for Paul with reference to his doctrine of justification, the concepts of which might have been brought to mind in the recitation of I.3.16b. One could also note the use of δικαίωμα in Rom. 5.18 as "righteous act". Moffatt's translation reads: "As one man's trespass issued in doom for all, so one man's act of redress issued in acquittal and life for all". G. Schrenk (Op. Cit., pp. 68f.) again writes: "This harmonizes with what Paul says elsewhere, viz., that the Christ, put under the Law (Gal. iv.4), not only knew no sin (II Cor. 5.21) in the sense of personal wrong-doing, but also, positively, was obedient even unto death (Phil. ii. 8)".

245. Infra, p. 287.

III. AN ANALYSIS OF HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

A. Concerning Problem and Method.

I.3.16b, as a 'Bekenntnislied', arose as a response of faith to the revelation of Jesus Christ. But it would be wrong to suppose that, because of the immediate nature of this revelation, the form and content of the pericope were not influenced by the surrounding, non-Christian environment.

According to S. Neill:¹

"...the Church from its beginnings has never lived in a closed ghetto, it has acted and reacted with its surroundings; it is perfectly correct to inquire into the origin of its thoughts and words, and into the influence that the environment may have exercised on them".

Surely, since Jesus Christ was revealed in history, one must remain open to the possibility of historical interaction and borrowing of existing religious phenomena, especially in Christological statements. In this regard, the plea of G.H.C. Macgregor is relevant:²

"One hopes that the day is over when one sought to understand Christianity by deliberately setting side by side the worst side of paganism and the best of Christianity, by contrasting the bestialities of a Petronius with the spiritual genius of a John. Modern scholarship will evaluate our religion by scrutinizing it not merely in contrast but also in contact with its environment".

Since I.3.16b did not appear out of thin air, an attempt must be made to ascertain its historical setting and to clarify the influence of that setting on the form. Hence, the question of this chapter's analysis:

'To what extent did I.3.16b appropriate to itself patterns, forms of expression, leading theological concepts and ideas from the surrounding religious milieu?'

1. The Interpretation of the New Testament: 1861-1961, London, 1966, p. 159.
2. G.H.C. Macgregor and A.C. Purdy, Jew and Greek: Tutors unto Christ, London, 1936, p. 195. See also G. Ladd, The New Testament and Criticism, Grand Rapids, 1967, p. 218.

But in approaching this question, one becomes aware of the problems of such an analysis and of the need for an adequate methodology. Since the 19th century, great advances in the knowledge of the history of religions have shown that at many points the Old and New Testaments coincide with ideas indigenous to other contemporary religions. For this reason, many scholars think that there was to some extent an evolution of religious concepts which would account for the parallelism of ideas and which could be traced historically from one religious milieu to another. Nevertheless, caution is required here for the following reasons:

1) First, it may be that the author of I.3.16b borrowed certain concepts, terms and/or patterns from his contemporary religious milieu. But with it the possibility also exists that new content was poured into these borrowed religious phenomena. In this case, their primary significance lies not in their antecedent-pagan usage but in their current-Christian usage; and one must ask not just whether ideas of ethnic origin have entered into the creation of I.3.16b, but primarily to what extent the author has made use of them. Thus, the method of historical inquiry must be two-fold: first, to endeavour by inductive historical criticism to discover points of similarity (as well as dissimilarity) between I.3.16b and its contemporary religious milieu; second, to ask further what creative and transforming effect the gospel of Jesus Christ had on the borrowed religious phenomena in their new Christian setting.³

3. In any case, it is certainly wrong, methodologically, to approach I.3.16b presupposing that the interpretation is entirely dependent upon the usage of its concepts and

2) Furthermore, the attempt to compare I.3.16b with similar patterns and traditions found in other religious contexts faces the twin-dangers of oversimplification and of forcing an interpretation which may not be justified. S. Neill warns:⁴

"...in this excessive interest in systematization, we all too easily forget that tradition, whether literary or preliterate, is a living thing and far too flexible ever to be satisfactorily reduced to system. Whatever form of classification we adopt, we are likely to find that the exceptions are as numerous as the items which fit into our scheme...No one is likely to deny that there is value in the classification of material. The question at once arises, however, whether the classification really arises out of the material itself or whether it has been imposed upon it."

Nevertheless, various attempts have already been made to relate I.3.16b to contemporary religious patterns and concepts - an ancient Egyptian coronation ceremony, the Gnostic Redeemer-myth, the divine man concept, Hellenistic-spatial concepts, Judaic-spatial concepts together with the figure of Wisdom in the Jewish Wisdom literature, and the 'Descensus ad Inferos' of I Peter 3.18ff. Consequently, the analysis will need to consider the possible dependence of I.3.16b on these traditions. But in each case, the inquiry must pursue the following questions: a) Is there adequate basis in I.3.16b for supposing that its formation was directly dependent upon the antecedent

Contd.] patterns in antecedent religious contexts. The application of such a naturalistic historicism has no room for the acts of God in history (through revelation and providence). Supra, Chap. II, p. 84. Note also the position of G.H.C. Macgregor (Ibid.) who regards the view "which would hold that Christianity is simply the fortuitous concourse of religious atoms already at hand without the intervention of any divine Providence" as false as the other extreme which regards Hellenism as having no formative influence on Christianity.

4. Op. Cit., pp. 244, 246.

form? Or should it be supposed that the similarity which may exist amounts to no more than a natural and common mode of speech and to coincidence? b) If the possibility of direct dependence exists, is there any sign that the antecedent usage was a significant influence in the formation of the content of I.3.16b? Or can it be claimed that only a basic pattern well-known in the contemporary world was used? Only through an honest effort to answer these questions can one begin to avoid the twin-dangers of oversimplification and of forced interpretation.

Furthermore, when the possible dependence of I.3.16b on any one of the above-mentioned patterns or concepts is concerned, care must be taken to distinguish between the background which influenced the creation of the form and the later interpretation of this form by various members of the Christian community. The analysis is primarily concerned with the former, with those ideas, schemes, forms of expression and modes of thought which contributed to its conception. In this regard, there is reason to suppose (anticipating the conclusion of this analysis) that the author was not entirely dependent upon any one of these patterns or concepts. However, it may be that certain members of the Christian community who recited I.3.16b thought in terms of the Gnostic Redeemer-myth, or the figure of Wisdom, etc., depending upon their respective backgrounds. There was always this possibility. Nevertheless, this analysis is primarily concerned with the background of the author and not of the audience of I.3.16b.

3) A further complication consists in the fusion of Hebraic and Hellenistic ideas and patterns of thought in the first century A.D., an age of transition and cross-currents. In the past, many scholars based their research on the theory that there was a vast difference between these two worlds of thought. But more recent studies have demonstrated "that Hellenism had invaded Palestine of the New Testament era more pervasively than used to be thought".⁵ Moreover, assuming that Christianity began on Palestinian soil, this fusion of ideas is to be expected in New Testament documents which were not only written in Greek but were also the product of Gentile mission.⁶ This raises the question whether it is meaningful to make a sharp distinction between Hebraic and Hellenistic thought in the first century A.D.?

5. R.H. Gundry, "The Form, Meaning and Background of the Hymn Quoted in I Timothy 3:16", Apostolic History and the Gospel, ed. W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin, Grand Rapids, 1970, pp. 216f. That Judaism was open to and receptive of Hellenistic influences is now largely accepted. See especially S. Lieberman, Greek in Jewish Palestine, New York, 1942; idem., Hellenism in Jewish Palestine, New York, 1962; E.R. Goodenough, Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period, XII, New York, 1965; M. Hengel, Judentum und Hellenismus, Tübingen, 1969; J.N. Sevenster, Do You Know Greek? Leiden, 1968; W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1970, pp. vii-xv.

The ensuing discussion of the relation of Hebraic, Judaic and Hellenistic ideas and patterns of thought is fairly familiar material. But this review is included for the dual purpose of clarifying the present writer's understanding of the problems involved in making clear distinctions between these settings, and of suggesting tentative distinctions which may serve to identify the background of the various concepts found in I.3.16b.

6. Cf. R.H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology, London, 1969², esp. p. 17; also F.C. Grant, Roman Hellenism and the New Testament, London, 1962, esp. Chap. 4.

The difficulty is partly due to a lack of clarification between Hebraism (the religion of the Old Testament) and Judaism on the one hand, and Judaism and Hellenism on the other hand. Concerning the relation of Judaism to Hebraism, L. Goppelt writes:⁷

"Judaism is not 'the religion of the Old Testament'. Rather it is the way of life of the Jewish people, characterized by a particular way of interpreting the Old Testament revelation...Judaism as well as the term Jew came into being during and after the Babylonian Exile (587-538 B.C.). There would have been no Judaism had there not first been this loss of national self-government and the subsequent scattered existence of the Jewish people in the Diaspora (Dispersion)."

It was during and after the Exile that the Jews experienced an intellectual movement towards enlightenment. Their world was rapidly expanding as they were being pushed out of their sheltered existence. There was a lively exchange of ideas as they came into closer contact with the surrounding cultures. On the one hand, being in large part a dispersed people and constantly under the pressure of Hellenistic influence,⁸ the

7. Jesus, Paul and Judaism, New York, 1964, pp. 20f. Goppelt acknowledges that some scholars prefer to view Judaism as beginning officially after the Jewish War (A.D. 70). But he rightly observes that "the development which does end in talumdic Judaism clearly begins already in the Exile, even if it takes the rejection of the gospel and the demolition of the Temple before it achieves sole dominion within the Jewish people" (p. 21, n. 3). Concerning the rise of Judaism, see also the following discussions: G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, I, trans. D.M.G. Stalker, Edinburgh/London, 1962, pp. 85-102; D.S. Russell, The Jews from Alexander to Herod, London, 1967; A.C. Purdy, Op. Cit., Part I; G.F. Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, Cambridge, 1927; W. Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter, Tübingen, 1926.

8. The term 'Hellenism' is used in this thesis to describe that epoch of the Greek dominance of world culture after the time of Alexander the Great, and is not limited to the narrower sense denoting the classic culture of Athens. Infra, pp. 188ff.

Jews felt the need to preserve their self-identity. This they were able to do by holding fast to Hebraic monotheism and by observing God's holy Law together with its moral requirements and cultic practices.⁹ On the other hand, the Jews also had a desire to expand with the times. As W.D. Davies notes, recent scholarship has confirmed what historical probability would suggest, "that Judaism was open to and receptive of Hellenistic influences on all sides".¹⁰

That the Jews were influenced by the general cultures and beliefs of the Hellenistic world is evidenced both in their history and in their literature. In their history, the general policy of the Seleucid kings, the presence of active Hellenistic sympathizers found even among the leaders of the Jews in Jerusalem, and the vigorous attempt by Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) to stamp out Judaism as a religion all had their effect upon Judaism. Although the Maccabean Revolt helped stem the tide of Hellenism and temporarily won political independence for the Jewish people, "Hellenism as a cultural factor continued to play a vital part in the life of the Jewish people".¹¹

In the Jewish literature of this period extending to

9. Note the discussion of A.C. Purdy (Op. Cit., pp. 146-7), which begins and ends with these statements: "Although the little Jewish community in and about Jerusalem constituted only a fraction of the Jews in the world of the first century, Judaism maintained an extraordinary degree of unity...When neither language nor geographical location ensured the solidarity of Judaism, the synagogue and devotion to the Law, both written and oral, guaranteed unity".

10. Op. Cit., p. viii; also n. 6.

11. D.S. Russell, Op. Cit., p. 58. I am indebted to A.C. Purdy's discussion (Op. Cit., pp. 28ff.) in this paragraph.

A.D. 70, the increased use of the Greek language may be observed: and where there was the language, there would also be some of the thought. There were also concepts, progressively developed, which appear to have been influenced by the surrounding cultures. Several examples of this influence will be discussed in the analysis which follows. But for the present, to use a single illustration, one may refer to the Jewish figure of Wisdom. Although the personification of Wisdom may have had its roots in Hebraic thought, there is good reason to suppose that certain features found in the later Wisdom literature (namely Wisdom and I Enoch) were influenced by similar notions in foreign religions.¹² Because of this and the many similar indications of extraneous influence in Jewish literature and culture, the late E.R. Goodenough considered it unnecessary to look any further than Jerusalem to find all the presuppositions necessary for Hellenistic influence on the gospel.¹³

12. Infra, pp. 243ff. Other Hebraic concepts which would appear to have been appreciably developed in Judaism due to Hellenistic influence and which may be related to I.3.16b include the use of spatial patterns of thought, the increased interest and speculation in cosmology and angelology, and the κατάβασις / ἀνάβασις pattern to which has become attached the pre-existence and ultimate deification of the divine being. All of these aspects will be discussed in the following analysis.

13. Op. Cit., pp. 55f. Note also the following statement by W.D. Davies (Op. Cit., p. 8): "Palestinian Judaism is not to be viewed as a watertight compartment closed against all Hellenistic influences: there was a Graeco-Jewish 'atmosphere' even at Jerusalem itself". Nevertheless, G.F. Moore (Op. Cit., II, pp. 298-9) points out that the extent to which Hellenization reached the ordinary Jew with little education must always be a matter of conjecture. According to R.H. Pfeiffer (History of New Testament Times, New York, 1949, p. 96): "Hellenism prevailed only in the cities and chiefly among the upper classes of the native populations. The countryside, where rural folk retained their old languages and customs, was scarcely affected by Hellenism". [Contd.]

Thus, while Judaism was the heir of Hebraism, it also received benefits from Hellenism. This means that the Judaism of the New Testament era should not be automatically equated with the Hebraism preceding the Exile. Certain concepts which took shape during the post-exilic period would not have been at home in Old Testament thought. These concepts, therefore, cannot be thought of as 'Hebraic', even though they were part of first century A.D. Judaism. For an example, reference may again be made to the figure of Wisdom in I Enoch 42.1f. To say that this figure is Hebraic because it is found in Jewish apocalyptic literature and was no doubt part of popular Jewish thought is to create a false impression; for in reality, certain main features of its presentation appear foreign to Hebraic monotheism and native to another milieu. This is not to discount the possibility that these 'foreign' features were reshaped and re-interpreted by the Hebraic consciousness of Judaism, nor that the Old Testament may have prepared the way for the development of the figure of Wisdom. Rather, it is to affirm that credit should be given to Hellenism for those features and concepts which can be recognized as alien to Hebraic thought. Such distinctions will help to clarify the background of similar concepts found in I.3.16b, and to keep this analysis from confusing

Contd.] But when one takes into consideration the fact that Jews in Judea were exposed on all sides to Hellenistic influence - Egypt, Idumaea, Nabataea, Samaria (with its garrison of troops), Phoenicia and Philistia - together with the facts that Greek cities were planted throughout Palestine and Greek was spoken most everywhere else, it is questionable whether the uneducated Jews in Judea could have remained too aloof from the Hellenizing trend. Any conclusions, however, must remain tentative.

Hellenistic influence in Judaism with Hebraic.

Furthermore, this clarification between Judaism and Hebraism means that Hellenism was, to some extent, present and its influence felt from the very beginning of the Palestinian Christian Church. As G.H.C. Macgregor explains:¹⁴

"It is too often assumed that the Hellenistic element in Christianity is merely a late accretion, which corrupted an essentially Jewish religion and half-paganized the Christian Church. The truth is that...the Church was half Greek almost from the first...It is now generally recognized that the Hellenizing process began much earlier than writers such as Harnack and Hatch were wont to allow, and that there is in fact a Gentile bias from beginning to end of our New Testament".

This would be the logical conclusion if it is accepted that Palestinian-Judaism was generally influenced by Hellenism by the first century A.D.

This leads to the next question: How is one to distinguish between Judaism and Hellenism? This has been the focus of attention of numerous books and theses, and one cannot pretend to have a simple solution.¹⁵ Indeed, if the discussion of Judaism above proved anything, it showed that the line between Judaism and Hellenism was very fluid. First century Judaism was varied, complicated, and was in a state of flux.

14. Op. Cit., p. 330; see also pp. 346f. One may question whether the Church was, in fact, "half Greek" from the start. The extent to which Hellenism had invaded Palestine is a very important question and also a very difficult one to answer. Again, one's views must remain flexible here.

15. One cannot find a more extensive list (which is also up-to-date) of the works pertaining to this subject than that found in M. Hengel's Judentum und Hellenismus, pp. 580-627. The bibliography found in F.C. Grant's Roman Hellenism and the New Testament, pp. 188-208, esp. 193ff. and 200f., is also helpful.

The same was true of Hellenism. For it was not just a legacy from the classical age of Greece. It was essentially a syncretistic system incorporating beliefs and legends of much of the contemporary civilization effected by the conquests of Alexander the Great. For as he went East, as D.S. Russell describes it,¹⁶

"...there came flooding back into the lands of the West ideas and influences completely foreign to the Greek way of thinking and living. The Persian empire which Alexander took over had itself taken over the old Babylonian empire, with its interest in cosmology, astronomy, occultism, demonology, and angelology. Besides these the Zoroastrian religion of the old Iranian or Persian empire was a powerful factor...This Perso-Babylonian confusion of culture...intermingling with the Greek culture from the West, gradually built up a syncretistic system of belief..."

Egyptian religion and philosophy made their own contribution, and there are even signs of Jewish influence as well.¹⁷ Although Hellenism as a political force was terminated by Rome, Rome could not escape the legacy of Alexander.¹⁸ Graeco-

16. Op. Cit., pp. 27f. Russell's brief section entitled "The spread of Hellenism" (pp. 23ff.) is an excellent summary of the subject.

17. Cf. C.H. Dodd on the Hermetica in The Bible and the Greeks, London, 1954; A.D. Nock, Conversion, Oxford, 1933, pp. 78f.; idem., Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background, New York, 1964, pp. 2f.; D.S. Russell, Op. Cit., pp. 103ff.; A.C. Purdy, Op. Cit., pp. 150f. Various facts combined would point in this direction: the translation of the Hebrew scriptures into Greek (LXX) thereby making them accessible to curious Hellenists; the apologetic writings of men like Philo and Josephus; the extent of the Dispersion; the number of synagogues throughout the Graeco-Roman culture in the first century A.D.; the presence of proselytes; the Jewish influence felt during the Maccabean and Herodian Periods. But any conclusion as to the extent of Judaic influence abroad must remain tentative.

18. Cf. F.C. Grant, Op. Cit., pp. 83f. R.H. Pfeiffer (Op. Cit., p. 97) prefers to limit the Hellenistic age so that the Roman age is not included. But it would appear that Hellenism was characterized more by its spirit of syncretism and universalism than by its political borders, and the Romans

[Contd.]

Roman Hellenism knew no limits geographically, culturally or religiously. It was inclusive, universalistic in outlook. And to comprehend and fully appreciate the character of Hellenism, a detailed review of its varied features from an historical perspective must be undertaken. To approach either Judaism or Hellenism phenomenologically with the purpose of discovering and thereby contrasting their distinctive features, therefore, runs the risk of overlooking their variable and changing nature.

Nevertheless, while the Jews shared to some extent that internationalism which was the mark of Graeco-Roman Hellenism, and while certain cultural barriers were being put aside, other barriers remained (from their Hebraic heritage) and were being fortified against the possible absorption of Judaism in Hellenism. Even though there were various views within Judaism itself - Sadducees, Pharisees, Apocalyptists, Essenes, Zealots, educated and uneducated, dispersed and Palestinian - there appears to have been a "normative type of Judaism" which developed in reaction to the hellenizing process and which finally became consolidated in the Mishnah (and of course ultimately, the Talmud).¹⁹ Behind this entire development

Contd.] were heir to this spirit. Cf. A.J. Toynbee, Hellenism: the History of a Civilization, London, 1959, chapter 12; also, G.H.C. Macgregor, Op. Cit., pp. 198f., 212f.

19. G.F. Moore, Op. Cit., I, pp. 3f. Moore emphasizes "that this goal was not reached without many conflicts of parties and sects and more than one grave political and religious crisis, but in the end the tendency which most truly represented the historical character and spirit of the religion prevailed, and accomplished the unification of Judaism". The term 'normative' Judaism is helpful only if one takes into account the development of the norm, and recognizes with it the diversity of pre-Christian Judaism.

was the belief shared by all professing Jews in the one, sovereign, transcendent, yet personal God. As One, He alone is to be worshipped and praised. This contrasts with any form of polytheism - 'divine men', the Caesar-cult, the gods of other nations, lesser divine beings such as are found in astrology, demonology and angelology, etc.²⁰ As Sovereign, he alone rules and has power over all things. This stands against the entire Hellenistic idea received from the East (perhaps originally, from Babylon),

"that the stars are gods, with the consequence that each of them (i.e. the planets) received the name of a Greek god, was accepted by the Greeks and Romans and provided the scientific basis for the cosmic system assumed by astrology and for the causal sequence of Fate (*Εἰσαγγελία*)".²¹

As Transcendent, he is not to be identified with his creation. There is no thought of pantheism, nor of his being identified with human beings. In Hellenism, gods were often "human beings deified for their achievements"²² (divine men, Caesar, etc.). Likewise, in Hellenistic mysticism, the initiate aims at union with God, a climax conceived as 'a being deified'.²³

20. In syncretistic Hellenism, there is a tendency towards monotheism. Gods are identified with one another, and the many gods become regarded as manifestations of the one supreme God under many names. Cf. M.P. Nilsson, Greek Piety, trans. H.J. Rose, Oxford, 1948, pp. 115-124; Also A.D. Nock, Early Gentile Christianity, pp. 8ff. However, Judaism remains inflexible here, as G.F. Moore (Op. Cit., p. 112) observes: "There could be but one religion properly deserving the name, for God is One; and revelation was not only consistent but identical throughout, for God is ever the same".

21. F.C. Grant, Op. Cit., p. 51f.

22. A.D. Nock, Op. Cit., p. 11.

23. W.D. Davies, Op. Cit., p. 14.

This kind of mysticism and deification of men is impossible to Judaism in which "the distinction between the Creator and the creatures is never lost".²⁴ As Personal, he is a living God who has revealed himself to man through his deeds rather than through philosophic inquiry. One does not find so much of the speculative interest in the divine as in Hellenism; for all that can be known about God has already been revealed to their forefathers, and recorded in the Law and Prophets or passed down orally through the centuries.

But while the Shema of Deuteronomy 6.4ff. was the quintessence of Jewish faith, it did not occupy the centre of Jewish attention. For as G.F. Moore has pointed out, monotheism was an accepted fact, and the Jews were primarily concerned about discerning and following God's revealed will:²⁵

"Naturally...when men thought of revealed religion, it was a religion as a rule of life rather than as the recognition of the one true God; and this the more because it was the interpretation and application of the rule of life, not the knowledge of God, on which there was discussion in the schools and controversy between sects".

24. Ibid. Cf. also A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, trans., W.A. Montgomery, London, 1931, p. 37; also G.H.C. Macgregor, Op. Cit., p. 162. On the doctrine of the transcendence of God in Judaism, infra, pp. 241ff.

25. Op. Cit., p. 276. A.C. Purdy (Op. Cit., p. 79) is of the opinion that "community of observance even more than unity of belief, in any creedal sense, was mainly responsible for the survival of Judaism". Certain Jewish scholars have maintained that Judaism has traditionally been more of an orthopraxy than an orthodoxy. Cf. I. Abrahams, Judaism, London, 1910. pp. 23f.; L. Baeck, The Essence of Judaism, trans., V. Grubwieser and L. Pearl, London, 1936, p. 4. W.D. Davies ("Torah and Dogma: A Comment", HTR, 6 (1968), p. 93) also speaks of Judaism as retaining "a kind of massive halakic simplicity, suspicious of speculation and uninterested in dogma", and insists that "the actuality of obedience to the Torah, not theological interpretation of it, has been the hallmark of Judaism".

Emphasis was laid upon the observance of God's holy Law, the Torah, and living a righteous life according to its precepts.²⁶ The precedent was set by Ezra who brought the book of the Law of Moses back from Babylon and read it before all the people; and Nehemiah records that they responded by fasting and humiliation, with confession of their sins and the sins of their forefathers, and bound themselves by covenant to the observance of God's Law (Neh. 8-10). Through the successive generations, there were differences, often acute, as to the interpretation of the Law. But as D.S. Russell notes, behind these differences "lay a deep loyalty on the part of all of them to the Law itself", the five books of Moses.²⁷ Through obedience to the Law, it was believed that God would hear their prayers and respond by shaping the course of history to Israel's salvation.²⁸

-
26. C.H. Dodd (The Bible and the Greeks, chap. 2) has shown that 7719 (Torah) basically signifies 'teaching' or 'instruction' such as was given in pre-exilic times by means of the sacred oracle. But in Judaism, its meaning became more comprehensive than this. G.F. Moore (Op. Cit., I, p. 263) defines it as "the comprehensive name for the divine revelation, written and oral, in which the Jews possessed the sole standard and norm of their religion". However, the Jews were divided as to whether the 'oral' tradition was as authoritative as the 'written' tradition. For this reason, reference below will be made only to the 'Law' meaning the five books of Moses, to which all parties subscribed.
27. Op. Cit., pp. 114f.; see pp. 112-118 on the development of the use of the Torah in Judaism from Ezra to the Mishnah; also G.F. Moore, Op. Cit., Part I; R. Bultmann (Primitive Christianity, trans., R.H. Fuller, London, 1956, p. 60, first paragraph) gives a very similar summary.
28. There is some question as to an antagonism between apocalyptic and legalistic Judaism. For a careful appraisal of this question, see W.D. Davies' chapter on "Apocalyptic and Pharisaism" in his book Christian Origins and Judaism, London, 1962, pp. 19ff. Davies also notes (p. 29): "Various Rabbis differed in their reaction to Apocalyptic, much as modern Christians differ in their view of Second Adventism".

This preoccupation with the Law as the means of salvation may be contrasted with Hellenism,

"a world which did not know Judaism or which hated and despised it, a world which was unacquainted with the prophets and familiar with cults not pretending to exclusiveness, with mysteries not always requiring a moral standard of their devotees, with an unchangeable and unmoral order of destiny determined, or at least indicated, by the stars, with magic of various kinds".²⁹

Whereas in Judaism living had to do with piety here and now, in Hellenism living had to do with being made to feel at home in the universe, free from the fear of death, of demons and of Fate. Whereas in Judaism pessimism was attached to the awareness of the universality and devastating effects of sin, in Hellenism pessimism was caused by the belief that "the universe was controlled by Fate, by relentless and evil powers ordering all things through the planets and their course through the fixed stars".³⁰ Whereas in Judaism one finds a stimulus to right living, in Hellenism this stimulus is generally lacking.³¹ Whereas in Judaism knowledge of God was

29. A.D. Nock, Early Gentile Christianity, p. 3. Nock discusses (pp. 17-23) the question of morality in Graeco-Roman Hellenistic philosophy and religion and concludes that their moral standards were not only lower than those of Judaism, but that "popular standards as distinct from those of ascetics and of coterie poets of dissipation, were probably somewhat lower than they are today" (p. 88). His book was re-edited in 1964.

30. W.L. Knox, "Pharisaism and Hellenism" in Judaism and Christianity: The Contact of Pharisaism with other Cultures, Vol. II, ed. H. Loewe, London, 1937, p. 94. For a synopsis and significant references to the subject of fate, determinism and despair in the Hellenistic world, cf. R.P. Martin, Carmen Christi, London, 1967, pp. 306-9. A very important basis for this increased trend towards fatalism was the geocentric view of cosmology. For a synopsis of Hellenistic cosmology, see M.P. Nilsson, Op. Cit., pp. 96-103.

31. Supra, n. 29.

closely related to obedience to his will,³² in Hellenism knowledge of God was primarily attached to theoretical contemplation. Whereas in Judaism redemption is concerned with guilt and sin, in Hellenism, according to P. Wendland, this is not the case:³³

"...the peculiar characteristic of all Hellenistic doctrines of redemption clearly emerges. Redemption is concerned not so much with guilt and sin as with corporeity and matter, finiteness and transitoriness. Guilt and sin themselves appear as physical defilement, since they are grounded in man's material nature. Therefore redemption is conceived of as essentially 'physical' (naturhaft), and is determined by the dualism both of man's nature and of the two worlds".

Of course, these contrasts should be taken generally and tentatively since there were exceptions to the rule and variations within the beliefs and practices of both Judaism and Hellenism. Indeed, as G.H.C. Macgregor makes clear, "the very quality of Hellenism in general makes it provokingly difficult to fix and define the chief characteristics of its religion".³⁴ The polarity here described is useful only in so far as it helps to clarify what appears to have been stressed or of primary concern in the respective cultures. For only through such clarification will it be possible to make more meaningful distinctions between the Hebraic, Judaic and/or Hellenistic elements which may have influenced I.3.16b.

32. According to A. Richardson (An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, London, 1961, p. 40): "In the OT 'knowledge of God' is virtually a synonym for obedience to God's will (e.g. Hos. 6.6), and to know God means to exercise lovingkindness, judgment and righteousness, as Yahweh himself does (Jer. 9.24)...Thus, knowledge in the biblical sense of the word is not theoretical contemplation..."

33. "Hellenistic Ideas of Salvation in the Light of Ancient Anthropology", AJT, 17 (1913) p. 346.

34. Op. Cit., p. 215.

Moreover, these contrasts should not be allowed to divert attention from the large body of common ideas found in Judaism and Hellenism. Concerning Hellenism, F.C. Grant writes:³⁵

"There was a genuine movement in the direction of monotheism, the belief in one God and one only. There were ideas of divine providence, of a mediator between God and the world, of grace and help to meet man's need, of the divine response to prayer, of the divine demand of righteousness, all of which prepared men for the gospel..."

G.H.C. Macgregor also refers to the "heightened sense of sin and consciousness of the need of divine grace" which becomes a part of the later Hellenistic age.³⁶ These characteristics are certainly a part of first century A.D. Judaism as well. Where concepts are found which are understood by Jew and Gentile alike, time should not be spent splitting hairs over whether they are more Judaic or Hellenistic in character. However, when possible, it is important to know the history of the development of these commonly used concepts and, thence, whether they might have been emphasized more in a Judaic or in an Hellenistic environment. With this kind of information, it may be possible to suggest not only the background of the author, but also the kind of audience for which the form was written.

Having reviewed the difficulties posed by the fusion of Hebraic and Hellenistic concepts and patterns of thought by the first century A.D., the question must again be raised whether it is meaningful to make a sharp distinction between

35. Op. Cit., p. 115.

36. Op. Cit., p. 232.

these two worlds of thought? From the discussion, it is evident that the adjective 'sharp' in this question should be deleted. However, while the spirit of Hellenism was wide-spread and had even influenced the homeland of the Jews (extent unknown), certain differences remained between Judaism and Hellenism. The difficulty lies in identifying these differences, a difficulty compounded by the diversity of each culture and by their overlapping. Perhaps the tentative distinctions suggested in the discussion above may serve to clarify this problem with a view to distinguishing those influences and ideas which may have contributed to the creation of I.3.16b.

However, caution should be the rule in the following cases.

a) To ask whether I.3.16b is either Hebraic or Hellenistic is too narrow a question and, therefore, one should leave open the possibility that I.3.16b may be the result of a combination of influences. b) To think in terms of 'geographical' distinctions - Judaic-Palestinian versus Gentile-Hellenistic - is unwise, since the widespread Dispersion of the Jews and the conquests of Alexander and Rome effectively removed 'definite' geographical boundaries.³⁷ c) To hold onto the principle of 'early-Palestinian' as opposed to 'late-Hellenistic' is no longer safe, since, as E.R. Goodenough has shown, Hellenism

37. This is not to deny that Judea was more Judaic than Greece. It is only being suggested that because of the Dispersion and also of the intrusion of Hellenistic ideas into Palestine, it is unwise to suppose that if I.3.16b betrays a Judaic influence, then it must have been composed in Palestine, and vice versa.

may have already influenced Palestine to a large degree by New Testament times.³⁸ d) To be dogmatic about one's conclusions is to underestimate the difficulty of recovering the complex historical process now often lost to us.

4) Finally, it must be acknowledged that as soon as one gets beyond mere statistics in comparative analysis, the comparison is inevitably conditioned by one's own point of view. It is one thing to list similarities and differences between two traditions, but quite another thing to interpret these findings. In the words of E. Käsemann:³⁹

"Daß die Einzelergebnisse und das Gesamtverständnis durch den Blickpunkt des Exegeten bestimmt sind, ist selbstverständlich. Aber wie willkürlich und unkritisch werden die Grundpositionen häufig bezogen. Das Ideal voraussetzungsloser Wissenschaft wird heute wohl nirgendwo mehr geltend gemacht. Wie sehr ist jedoch auch die Radikalität des allein der Sache verantwortlichen Fragens verloren gegangen, um die es unter solchem Ideal nicht zuletzt sich handelte. Der Einfall ersetzt weithin die Methodik, und dem Leser bleibt überlassen, sich auf seine Weise mit dem ihm jeweils vorgesetzten Einfall abzufinden".

Although he recognizes that presuppositions will always remain a factor in analysis, Käsemann strikes hard at arbitrary and uncritical exegesis. He would counter this bankrupt approach with radical questioning which holds itself accountable solely

38. Supra, p. 186 & n. 13. R. Scroggs ("The Earliest Hellenistic Christianity", Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of E.R. Goodenough, ed. by J. Neusner, Leiden, 1968, p. 176) writes: "For too long the old scheme has seemed too convenient to give up, that the earliest Christianity was uninfluenced by Hellenistic thought and culture, so that materials suggesting this influence reflect a non-Palestinian milieu and a later date than the 'Jewish' materials. Of course, not many scholars have in recent years used this scheme in a rigid way; yet it stubbornly persists as a basic pattern".

39. "Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2.5-11", ZTK, 47 (1950) pp. 313f. Note the comments on presuppositional influence by A.D. Nock, Earliest Gentile Christianity, pp. 1f.; and A.C. Purdy, Op. Cit., pp. 159f.

to the subject matter of the text. It was with this in mind that the present writer chose to consider first the formal and linguistic aspects of the text, hoping that through a thorough acquaintance with the subject matter, a better understanding of its historical background might be reached.⁴⁰ Of course, there is no guarantee that the results of the former analyses are infallible; and there is a sense in which they need to be re-examined by the present historical analysis. For their inquiry lacked an adequate understanding of the historical setting of the passage. Nevertheless, a thorough examination of the form and content of I.3.16b has been made, and we are, therefore, in a better position to question 'radically' the options suggested by various scholars as to its historical background.

The difficulty of achieving true objectivity in an historical analysis is evident, but some progress is possible if one proceeds cautiously along the lines just outlined. Only in this way is it possible to come to terms with the questions raised by 'history of religions' and 'history of traditions' criticism.

The procedure will be to follow the various patterns and concepts which have been related to I.3.16b by recent scholars in the following order - an ancient Egyptian coronation

40. The present historical analysis must go hand in hand with the previous formal and linguistic analyses. R.H. Fuller (*Op. Cit.*, pp. 16ff.) refers to terms, images, concepts and patterns as 'tools' which the Church picked up from its environment and used for its response to the revelation of Christ. In the same way, they may be 'tools' for our inquiry into the background from which they were taken.

ceremony, the Gnostic Redeemer-myth, the divine man concept, Hellenistic-spatial concepts, Judaic-spatial concepts together with the figure of Wisdom in the Jewish Wisdom literature, and the 'Descensus ad Inferos' of I Peter 3. 18ff. It is hoped that through a critical analysis comparing these contemporary religious phenomena with I.3.16b, a better understanding of the historical setting of the form and of those 'patterns, forms of expression, leading theological concepts and ideas' which would have contributed to its formation will be reached.

B. The Basic Analysis.

1. J. Jeremias - an Egyptian coronation ceremony:

J. Jeremias, following E. Norden, attempts to account for the structure of I.3.16b by utilizing the formal pattern of an ancient enthronement ritual of Egypt or of the Near East generally. This pattern, he writes, consisted of the following actions:⁴¹

- "1. der neue König erhält in feierlicher Sinnbildhandlung göttliche Eigenschaft (Erhöhung);
2. der nunmehr vergottete König wird dem Kreise der Götter vorgestellt (Präsentation);
3. danach erst wird ihm die Herrschaft übertragen (Inthronisation)".

41. Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus, Göttingen, 1953⁶, pp. 22f.; idem., Jesus' Promise to the Nations, London, 1958, pp. 38f. Numerous other scholars have at least acknowledged (if not accepted) this triplicate coronation scheme and most of them have referred to Jeremias as their source. This present section assumes the reader's acquaintance with the summary in Chap. I, pp. 49-52, of the Egyptian coronation ceremony hypothesis.

D.M. Stanley accepts this pattern without reservation,⁴² and confesses his dependence upon Jeremias and C. Spicq who in his L'Épître aux Hébreux sees this pattern as the background of Hebrews 1.5-13.⁴³ Interestingly, O. Michel concurs with Spicq on Hebrews,⁴⁴ and finds the pattern present as well in Matthew 28.18-20.⁴⁵ Jeremias suggests that E. Käsemann also finds the scheme in both Hebrews 1.5-14 and Phil. 2.6-11.⁴⁶

There are, of course, parallels between this ceremonial scheme and I.3.16b. The first stage of the ceremony (Erhöhung) corresponds approximately with the first two lines: the one who appeared in the fleshly realm has been vindicated in the realm of the spirit - is exalted. The second stage (Präsentation) can be discovered without difficulty in the appearance of the Exalted One to the angels of the heavenly court and his proclamation to the nations (ll. iii, iv). Likewise, the third stage (Inthronisation) corresponds with the last two lines: his reception as Lord as men submit

42. "Carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere...", CBQ, 20 (1958) pp. 184f.; idem., Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology, Romae, 1961, p. 237. He also finds the pattern in Col. 2.15; Heb. 1.5ff.

43. Vol. II, Paris, 1952, p. 23.

44. Der Brief an die Hebräer, Göttingen, 1936, p. 26.

45. "Der Abschluß des Matthäusevangeliums", Evangelische Theologie, 10 (1950-1) p. 22. Michel also compares it with Phil. 2.5ff., but, surely, the parallel does not begin until vv. 9f. Note R.P. Martin's acceptance (Carmen Christi, pp. 242f.) of the influence of this scheme on vv. 9ff.

46. Jesus' Promise, to the Nations, pp. 38f. It is true that Käsemann speaks of a heavenly enthronement in connection with Heb. 1.5ff. (Das wandernde Gottesvolk, Göttingen, 1957, pp. 59-71), and that he speaks of elevation and presentation and enthronement in connection with Phil. 2.6 ff. ("Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2,5-11", pp. 346ff.). But, unfortunately for Jeremias, Käsemann never refers to an ancient Egyptian (or other oriental) coronation ritual. Instead, he speaks in terms of Hellenism and of the "gnostischen Urmensch-Lehre".

themselves in faith and as he is taken up 'in glory' and seated at God's right hand.

J.N.D. Kelly describes Jeremias' view as "ingenious and attractive", but he goes on to say that "a) there are difficulties in working out his scheme (e.g. if it is accepted, the deliberate parallelisms seem to lose their point), and b) it is doubtful whether the superficial similarity of patterns is more than a coincidence".⁴⁷ Two recent German commentators, N. Brox and J. Freundorfer, both question the scheme in passing, the former writing: "Doch sind die Entsprechungen dieser Stilform zu den einzelnen Gliedern des Liedes nicht gerade deutlich".⁴⁸ In the discussion above in Chapter I,⁴⁹ some of the difficulties of comparing I.3.16b with the coronation scheme were mentioned. The major weakness consists in the interpretation of lines i and ii as the 'Erhöhung'. For line i connotes more the idea of human weakness and limitation than of preparation for exaltation; and lines iii and vi sound more like elevation and exaltation than line ii. Moreover, Jeremias suggests that divinization, as in the first stage

47. A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles (BNTC), London, 1963, pp. 92f. R.H. Gundry (Op. Cit., p. 208, n. 1) finds Kelly's first objection (a) pointless, that the use of the coronation scheme destroys the point of the antitheses; "for the exaltation, presentation, and enthronement could take place in the two halves of the cosmos in parallel fashion". But I think Kelly has more in mind the idea that if the parallelism of I.3.16b is simply patterned after another form, then the reality to which the parallelism is directed appears more like poetic fantasy.

48. Respectively: Die Pastoralbriefe (RNT, VII. 2), Regensburg, 1969, p. 161; Die Pastoralbriefe (RNT, VII), Regensburg, 1959, p. 235.

49. Supra, pp. 49ff.

of the coronation scheme, takes place in line ii, a questionable interpretation since it is doubtful that ἐδικαιώθη bears this nuance.⁵⁰ If there is any suggestion of divinization in I.3.16b, it might be found in line vi, but not in line ii. Also, it is difficult to understand how line iv relates to the presentation of "der nunmehr vergottete König" to the circle of the gods.

But these difficulties are minor in comparison to the questionable existence of Jeremias' three-fold scheme.

Jeremias' authority is E. Norden, who wrote:⁵¹

"Es gab ein aegyptisches Zeremoniell, das nach dem Urteil der Sachkenner hoch in das alte Reich hineinragt, in Büchern und Denkmälern des neuen Reiches sich erhalten und noch in der ptolemäisch-römischen Epoche unverkennbare Spuren zurückgelassen hat. Die Einsetzung eines Königs vollzog sich in drei Abschnitten, die ein französischer Aegyptologe mit den Akten einer dramatischen Handlung verglichen hat".

Norden's description of the three parts of the coronation ceremony is faithfully represented by Jeremias (see above). The question is whether the ceremony was actually patterned according to these three parts. The French Egyptologist to whom Norden refers is A. Moret; and the reference in Moret's work to which he refers⁵² says nothing of an installation which was enacted in three parts. In fact, it refers to a coronation

50. Supra, pp. 111ff.

51. Die Geburt des Kindes, Darmstadt, 1958 (reprint of 1924), pp. 118f.; see pp. 116-128. Norden was the first to suggest that I.3.16b was related to this three-fold coronation scheme (pp. 127f.).

52. Ibid., p. 119, n. 1. Norden refers to A. Moret's Du caractère religieux de la royauté pharaonique, Paris, 1902, p. 76; see pp. 75-113.

of five parts:⁵³

"Le rituel d'intronisation, à l'époque thébaine, comprenait cinq séries de cérémonies: 1) purification et présentation aux dieux du candidat royal; 2) présentation par le roi régnant ou par le dieu principal aux gens de la cour; 3) proclamation des noms officiels du nouveau roi; 4) remise des couronnes de la main des dieux; 5) donations et offrandes solennelles due roi aux dieux".

The only series of three to which A. Moret refers is found in a sequence of ceremonies or rites enacted on the day of coronation:⁵⁴

- 1) His being presented with the crowns of the North and South;
- 2) The unification of the two kingdoms under his feet;
- 3) His procession around the wall of Memphis.

This triad which is mentioned on the stone of Palermo has little to do with Norden's 'exaltation - presentation - enthronement' scheme.

Sir A. Gardiner informs us that "temple-scenes depicting a god placing the crown on a young sovereign's head are not uncommon, but verbal descriptions of the accompanying

53. Ibid. Someone might argue that there is some resemblance here to Norden's three-fold scheme. (1) The presentation of the king to the gods is somewhat parallel to Norden's 'exaltation'; (2) The king's presentation to the people of the court together with (3) the proclamation of his official names could relate to Norden's 'presentation to the circle of the gods'; and (4) the crowning of the king would be parallel to Norden's 'enthronement'. But there is no room in Norden's three-fold scheme for (5) the donations and solemn offerings by the king to the gods. And while there are similarities between Moret's five rituals and I.3.16b, there are obvious differences as well.

54. Op. Cit., pp. 98f.; see pp. 86ff.; also idem., The Nile and Egyptian Civilization, trans. M.R. Dobie, London, 1927, pp. 123-6ff. Note C.J. Bleeker's views (Egyptian Festivals, Leiden, 1967, pp. 95f.) concerning these three rituals and the part they played in the development of the coronation of the kings of Egypt.

ceremonies are very rare.⁵⁵ H.W. Fairman writes:⁵⁶

"No connected account of an Egyptian coronation has survived and at best the reliefs give us only a selection of the more significant items, and even the exact order of the ceremonies is uncertain".

The "Mystery Play of the Succession" which was translated by K. Sethe and carefully analysed by H. Frankfort is apparently a script on papyrus of a play celebrating the accession of Sesostris I.⁵⁷ But according to Fairman:⁵⁸

"...it is not easy to discern any logical development of the drama, and as a coronation play it diverges very greatly from much that we know about the coronation, for it omits many of the most important ceremonies, and even the affixing of the crown is merely given a passing reference and no more".

The accounts of the coronation ceremonies of both Hatshepsut and Haremhab are helpful, but again there is good reason to

-
55. "The Coronation of King Haremhab", JEA, 39 (1953) p. 13. Elsewhere ("The Baptism of Pharaoh", JEA, 36 (1950) p. 7), Gardiner warns that "it must never be forgotten that temple sculptures and tomb paintings are not necessarily authentic records of real happenings, but may merely belong to the world of imagination and make-believe".
56. "The Kingship Rituals of Egypt", Myth, Ritual and Kingship, ed. S.H. Hooke, Oxford, 1958, p. 78. Fairman goes on (pp. 78f.) to list eight or nine parts of the coronation ceremony which he considers to be important.
57. K. Sethe, Dramatische Texte zu altägyptischen Mysterienspielen, Leipzig, 1928; H. Frankfort, Kingship and the Gods, Chicago, 1948, Chap. 11. Note also the discussions of this 'Mystery Play' by H.W. Fairman, Op. Cit., pp. 81f; A.M. Blackman, "Myth and Ritual in Ancient Egypt", Myth and Ritual, ed. by S.H. Hooke, London, 1933, pp. 29ff.
58. Op. Cit., p. 82. Fairman refers to W. Helck's paper, "Bemerkungen zum Ritual des Dramatischen Ramesseumpapyrus", in Orientalia, xxiii, pp. 383-411. Sir A. Gardiner ("Haremhab", p. 24) stresses this same point. H. Frankfort (Op. Cit., p. 125) also finds that "The Mystery Play... presents us with an undifferentiated sequence of scenes..."

suppose that they are neither complete nor wholly accurate.⁵⁹
 This leaves us with the three detailed accounts of the sed-
 festival, which C.J. Bleeker has recently analysed. He con-
 cludes:⁶⁰

"It has been sufficiently demonstrated that, in the three best known instances, the rituals of this festival differ from each other...I believe we can never obtain any certainty about the exact course of the ceremonies, considering the fragmentary nature of the data and the uncertainty as to what the Egyptians wanted the representations of the *hꜥ sꜥ* to express".

59. According to H. Frankfort (*Op. Cit.*, p. 105), the reliefs in Hatshepsut's temple at Deir el Bahri "show us not the ritual procedure but rather the ideal significance of the event, serving...to proclaim the legitimacy and divine sanction of that theological monstrosity - a woman on the throne of Horus". For this reason, the consensus of Egyptological opinion regards the account of Hatshepsut's coronation as fictitious (cf. Sir A. Gardiner, "Haremhab", p. 22). Similarly, the inscription recording Haremhab's coronation must be approached with caution. For as Sir A. Gardiner has observed (p. 21), Haremhab needed to vindicate his claim to the throne, "having no royal blood in his veins...The favour of the gods was the chief pre-requisite, and this indeed is the main theme of his *cursus vitae*". Gardiner also finds that some of the main ceremonies connected with the coronation of Egyptian kings are not found in the inscription (p. 24). In general, according to H. Frankfort (*Op. Cit.*, p. 123): "The Memphite Theology, the story of Hatshepsut's birth and accession, and most of the pyramid texts are concerned with theory, not practice. At most we can suspect certain passages of their arguments to allude to ritual usage".
60. *Op. Cit.*, pp. 106f.; see pp. 96ff. The three detailed accounts of the sed-festival which Bleeker analyses are those of the kings Neuserre (6th dynasty), Amenhotep III (18th dynasty) and Osorkon (22nd dynasty). The following long quotation by Bleeker (p. 97) at the commencement of his analysis demonstrates for us the difficulty of using the sed-festival as a basis for determining the order and selection of the main rituals of the main coronation ceremony: "Firstly it should be properly realised that there is no text which accurately describes the course of this festival...Secondly it should be known that the data are very fragmentary and derive from the reigns of kings widely separated by centuries. Thirdly certain questions generally ignored must be posed, namely: a) was it the intention of the Egyptians to portray the ritual in its entirety, or did they only select the main episodes? b) have the

[Contd.]

Moreover, he finds important differences between these three sed-festivals and the coronation ceremony described on the Palermo stone.⁶¹

Thus, apart from the series of three rituals on the Palermo Stone which do not correspond to Norden's three-fold coronation scheme, there appears to be no evidence from other relevant sources to validate his point of view. In fact, this survey of the views of Egyptologists all of whom have participated in the analysis of the relevant ancient Egyptian texts suggests that the order and selection of the main rites in the coronation ceremony are still quite uncertain. In any case, there appears to be no reason for supposing with Norden the existence of a basic three-fold coronation scheme which persisted from the Old Kingdom all the way through to the New Testament era and influenced the order and content of I.3.16b.

Contd.] scholars who arranged the fragments of reliefs in a certain order in their publications succeeded in reconstructing the correct sequence? c) did the ritual take one day to perform or more? d) is it really feasible to reconstruct the sequence of the celebration of the rituals which are portrayed? e) what relationship exists between the *hb sd* and other festivals of the kings? Needless to say a conclusive answer to these questions cannot readily be found".

61. *Ibid.*, pp. 111f.; cf. 108-113. Many scholars consider the sed-festival as simply a re-enactment of the coronation ceremony. But Bleeker points out the difficulties with this point of view. Nevertheless, it is related to the original coronation at least in so far as it represents "a true renewal of kingly potency, a rejuvenation of rulership *ex opere operato*" (H. Frankfort, *Op. Cit.*, p. 79). See Frankfort's work, Chap. 6 and related footnotes (pp. 366ff.) for references of discussions of the *sed*-festival. Note also the discussions by H.W. Fairman, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 83f.; and I. Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East*, Uppsala, 1943, pp. 10f.

Nevertheless, Norden's pattern of 'exaltation - presentation - enthronement' does reflect, in general, what appears to have been the natural or common process involved in the making of a king in the ancient Near East. In most cultures, there is first the elevation of the intended king, then various rites including processions, proclamations, anointings, the homage of the nobles and the acceptance of the candidate by the gods, and finally (in importance, not always in sequence) the crowning of the king.⁶² If taken generally in this way, then there is good reason to suppose that this natural and common pattern concerned with the exaltation and enthronement of a king may have influenced⁶³ both the order and content of I.3.16b, a form portraying the exaltation and enthronement of Jesus Christ.

-
62. For further study: G. von Rad, "The Royal Ritual in Judah", The Problem of the Hexateuch, trans. E.W.T. Dicken, London, 1966, pp. 122ff. (who also points out that the two major accounts of royal coronations in the OT - those of Solomon and of Joash - both "describe unusual coronations" (p. 222), a factor held in common with the accounts of Hatshepsut and Haremhab in Egypt); I. Engnell, Studies in Divine Kingship, Uppsala, 1943; H. Frankfort, Op. Cit. (who also includes a small section on the Hebrew idea of kingship, pp. 337ff.); Myth, Ritual, and Kingship, ed. S.H. Hooke, which attempts to combine in one volume views held throughout the Near East concerning kingship; C.J. Gadd, Ideas of Divine Rule in the Ancient East, London, 1948, chap. 2; The Sacral Kingship, Studies in the History of Religions, Vol. IV, Leiden, 1959; S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, trans. G.W. Anderson, Oxford, 1959, chap. 3; and A.R. Johnson, Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel, Cardiff, 1967. This is not to minimize, of course, the differences which also existed between cultures concerning the idea of kingship (cf. S. Mowinckel, Op. Cit., Chap. 3).
63. Probably indirectly rather than directly; subconsciously more than consciously.

2. R. Bultmann - the Gnostic Redeemer-myth:

R. Bultmann suggests that the author of I.3.16b has taken over an old Gnostic hymn, patterned after the myth of the Gnostic Redeemer, and adapted it to his own Christian purposes.⁶⁴ Nor does he stand alone in this assessment.

64. Theology of the New Testament, London, 1968, I, pp. 174-8; II, pp. 147-154. According to Bultmann (I, pp. 166f.), there are "several variants of the myth. But the basic idea is constant: The demonic powers get into their clutches a person who originates in the light-world either because he is led astray by his own foolishness or because he is overcome in battle. The individual selves of the 'pneumatics' are none other than the parts or splinters of that light-person. Hence, in their totality they constitute that person - who is frequently called Primal Man - and for whose total redemption they must be released and 'gathered together'. Inasmuch as the world structure made by the demonic powers will necessarily crash when the sparks of light are withdrawn from it, the demons jealously guard their booty and attempt to stupefy the heavenly selves by the bustle and noise of this world, make them drunk and put them to sleep so as to make them forget their heavenly home.

"Redemption comes from the heavenly world. Once more a light-person sent by the highest god, indeed the son and 'image' of the most high, comes down from the light-world bringing Gnosis. He 'wakes' the sparks of light who have sunk into sleep or drunkenness and 'reminds' them of their heavenly home...He teaches them about the heavenly journey they will start at death and communicates to them the secret pass-words by virtue of which they can safely pass through the stations of this journey - past the demonic watchmen of the starry spheres. And going ahead he prepares the way for them, the way which he, the redeemer himself, must also take to be redeemed..."

Of particular importance in this mythological scheme is the role played by the demon-powers of this world. They are the ones responsible for imprisoning those 'sparks of light' which splintered from the Primal Man; and the work of the Redeemer consists in disarming these evil powers so that he, and with him the elected 'pneumatics', can discard their fetters and find their way back unmolested to their heavenly home. Hence, this process of redemption has cosmic dimensions; the disarming of the powers of the world means the end of the world itself, which is the creation of the evil powers and is transitory, once the divine 'pneuma' is withdrawn from it.

For discussions on Gnosticism and the Gnostic Redeemer-myth in particular, see the following important works: the
[Contd.]

B.S. Easton writes:⁶⁵

"Lying back of the concepts of the hymn is the myth of the 'Incognito Redeemer', widespread and popular in the Hellenistic world, which was adopted by the Christians as at least a partial means for expressing something of the significance of Christ".

It has also been observed above that F.C. Baur viewed I.3.16b as stemming from orthodox interaction with Gnosticism.⁶⁶ He supposed that I.3.16b represents a compromising attempt to bring together in one statement both anti-Gnostic and Gnostic ideas. For Baur, the orthodox picture of the historical Jesus ἐν σαρκί receives expression in lines i, iv and v, whereas the Gnostic picture of the heavenly Redeemer ἐν πνεύματι is represented in lines ii, iii and vi. More specifically, line ii relates to the baptism of Jesus, an idea prevalent in 2nd century Gnostic systems; line iii re-

Contd.] numerous, significant articles in Le Origini dello Gnosticismo, ed. V. Bianchi, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1967; R. McL. Wilson, The Gnostic Problem, London, 1958; idem., Gnosis and the New Testament, Oxford, 1968; R.M. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, New York, 1959; idem., Gnosticism: An Anthology, London, 1961; R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament; idem., Primitive Christianity; W. Bousset, Kyrios Christos, Göttingen, 1921, pp. 183ff.; H. Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, Boston, 1958; E. Bevan, Hellenism and Christianity, London, 1921; G. van Groningen, First Century Gnosticism: Its Origin and Motifs, Leiden, 1967; G. Quispel, Gnosis als Welt-religion, Zürich, 1951. Note also works by such scholars as R. Reitzenstein, H.A.A. Kennedy, G. Widengren, H. Ringgren, C. Colpe, J. Daniélou, etc. W. Schmithals (Die Gnosis in Korinth, Göttingen, 1969) has presented a full discussion of the Gnostic Redeemer-myth which should be carefully noted, and in which he defends the basic Bultmannian position.

65. The Pastoral Epistles, London, 1948, pp. 137f. Note also the statement by Käsemann (Das Wandernde Gottesvolk, p. 70): "I Tim. 3, 16 äußert und inhaltlich als Schema der gnostischen Anthropos-Lehre zu beschreiben ist".

66. Supra, pp. 31ff.

lates to the Redeemer's ascension through the realm of the spirit-powers; and line vi presents his ultimate, victorious reception in the presence of the highest god.

Although Bultmann agrees with Baur that the Gnostic Redeemer-myth lies behind I.3.16b, he would not, apparently, divide the form into anti-Gnostic and Gnostic parts. Instead, he regards lines ii - vi as a continuous description of the Redeemer's triumphant procession into heaven. For he compares line iv to I Peter 3.19, relating it to the preaching to the dead, explaining with reference to the latter verse:⁶⁷

"Die πνεύματα sind also diejenigen Seelen Verstorbenen, die von den feindlichen Geistermächten, die zwischen Himmel und Erde hausen, am Aufstieg in die Himmelswelt gehindert und gefangen genommen worden sind".

In this case, line v is hardly likely to refer back to something occurring in this world.

There are apparent weaknesses in the interpretations of both F.C. Baur and R. Bultmann. For example, it is questionable whether in the New Testament era the lines were so sharply drawn between orthodoxy and gnosticism as Baur assumes; and if this were the case, it is again doubtful that an attempt would be made to bring such opposite views together in one form. Bultmann's interpretation neglects to consider the probable parallelism contrasting earth and heaven in the text, and reads into lines iv and v a meaning which is unnat-

67. "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief", Coniectanea Neotestamentica, XI, in honor of A. Fridrichsen, Lund, 1947, p. 5. R. Bultmann (p. 5, n. 6) notes that O. Cullmann (The Earliest Christian Confessions, trans. J.K.S. Reid, London, 1949, p. 60) also finds in line iv a reference to Christ's preaching to the dead. Note our discussion above of this view, p. 144, n. 166; also infra, Sec. B.6.a.

ural.⁶⁸ Nevertheless, there are some important terminological parallels which would lend some credence to their point of view that I.3.16b was patterned after the Gnostic Redeemer-myth, even though their presentations of the theory are weak.⁶⁹

Line 1 - 'appeared in flesh' - could easily be interpreted from a Gnostic perspective. There is no direct reference here to either Christ's incarnation or crucifixion. Gnosticism was unable to assimilate such concepts into its systems of thought. According to R.M. Grant, there was one element which bound all the various expressions of Gnosticism together, i.e. "that the world is bad; it is under the control of evil or ignorance or nothingness. It cannot be redeemed".⁷⁰ For this reason, it was impossible for the Gnostic to think of the Redeemer as connected in any substantial way to this contaminated, lower world of the flesh; hence, the word 'appeared'.⁷¹

68. Supra, Chap. II, Secs. B.2 and 3.

69. To be fair, it must be pointed out that R. Bultmann nowhere presents a comprehensive elucidation of his interpretation of I.3.16b. However, this being the case, one wonders if it is justifiable to posit the theory that I.3.16b is dependent upon a specific background when the evidence has not been fully investigated.

70. Gnosticism: An Anthology, p. 15.

71. Gnostic dualism is one of substance; matter in itself is evil and the material world is necessarily identical with the realm of darkness. Hence, the world of flesh stands separated from the world of spirit, and Christ is viewed not as having 'become' man, but as having only been 'manifested' as man. As to the manner of his corporeal manifestation, a variety of speculations were in vogue in the 2nd century. But basically, there were two alternatives: a) either Christ's human nature was a mere illusion, in which case the man Jesus didn't exist at all (was only a shadow, an illusive appearance, the sole reality being the heavenly Christ); b) or the person of Jesus Christ was

[Contd.]

Moreover, just as the Gnostic Redeemer came not to die, but to impart knowledge which was necessary for the 'pneumatics' to attain full salvation and then to re-ascend from whence he came, so one might interpret lines iiff. as referring to this series of events. Consider, for instance, the following characteristics of 2nd century Gnosticism. First, 'spirit', in contrast to one's flesh, is that 'spark of light' in man which alone has the capacity of being saved from the imprisonment of this lower world. It is due to the merit of the Redeemer that this one possibility of escape is made accessible to the 'pneumatics', as Bultmann writes:⁷²

"He 'wakes' the sparks of light who have sunk into sleep or drunkenness and 'reminds' them of their heavenly home ...He teaches them about their heavenly journey...(etc.)"

Perhaps this could be read into line ii - that he 'was vindicated (to the pneumatics) in spirit'.

Second, our Linguistical Analysis above supported the view that ἡγεμόνες in line iii refers to those 'spirit-powers' who had not yet submitted to the Lordship of Christ. Bultmann heartily agrees, for he finds in line iii an important reference to Christ's victory over these cosmic powers, a theme which we have already observed is of utmost importance in the Gnostic Redeemer-myth.⁷³ This victory would be consummated

Contd.] viewed as a compound, the human aspect so detached from the Divine that we really have two persons. In the latter case, the man Jesus would be regarded as having originated distinct from the heavenly Christ, the heavenly Christ descending upon the man Jesus perhaps at Baptism and leaving him prior to Jesus' suffering and crucifixion. Note E. Bevan's discussion of these alternatives - Op. Cit., pp. 95ff.

72. Theology, I, p. 167. Supra, n. 64.

73. Theology, II, p. 153. Supra, n. 64.

in Gnostic thought by the fact that once the Redeemer had made his way through the seven spheres ruled by the seven kosmocrators, he was safely 'received in glory' (line vi).⁷⁴

Finally, the emphasis throughout I.3.16b on 'revelation' must be considered. Christ 'appeared' in flesh, 'was vindicated', 'appeared' to the angels and 'was proclaimed' to the nations. With this emphasis, one may compare the mission of the Gnostic Redeemer who came to enlighten and to reveal the path to salvation. His purpose was to remove the ignorance of one's own imprisoned condition and to impart 'gnosis' by which one might overcome after death those demonic elements which control the spheres through which one's spirit must travel to reach the highest God. Here is one who was revealed and who went on before us, challenged the powers and came through victoriously.

Together with these terminological parallels, there is the overall pattern of I.3.16b which is similar to that of the Gnostic Redeemer myth. In line i, there is reference to the coming of the 'pre-existent One' into the realm of flesh, a κατάβασις being implied similar to that more fully explicated in such traditional passages as Phil. 2.6ff. and John 1.1ff. Then subsequent to this κατάβασις is Christ's

74. According to Gnostic speculation, the present, visible world inhabited by man is separated from the highest God by a series of intermediary spheres (usually seven in number) over each of which rules one of the planetary demons or kosmocrators. These rulers determine what happens in their respective spheres, and the difficulty for the 'spark of light' is that after death it must make its way eventually through these domains to the Ogdoad or transcendent world beyond all of the seven spheres.

ἀνάβασις, his ascension and exaltation in the realm of spirit. In I.3.16b, this ἀνάβασις is largely expressed in terms of space, contrasting heaven with earth. Similarly, the Gnostic Redeemer-myth includes this κατάβασις / ἀνάβασις pattern. The ascent of the Redeemer is material, a transplantation in space.

These many and varied features may recall the idea of the Gnostic Redeemer. But how are we to evaluate the evidence? Was I.3.16b derived from the myth, or merely like it, or one of the starting points for it? Have we to do with Gnostic influence, or merely with Gnostic parallels? In the words of R. McL. Wilson:⁷⁵

"The vital question is not whether a particular word or idea can be paralleled in the later Gnostic theories, or even whether its 'Gnostic' meaning can be read into its use..., but whether this Gnostic meaning was in the mind of the author when he wrote".

To answer this question in the affirmative, it must be shown that the parallelism extends beyond terminological and formal considerations to include resemblances in essential thought and content. But the evidence does not support this conclusion, especially that which comes from a closer analysis of the text.

First, one must account for the fact that there is no trace of the radical, moral dualism so characteristic of Gnosticism in either its anthropological or its cosmological aspect. Although 'flesh' is contrasted with 'spirit' and

75. The Gnostic Problem, p. 71.

'world' with 'glory', moral connotations are nowhere in evidence. 'Flesh' is not thought of negatively in terms of evil. The 'nations' and the 'world' are not thought of as unredeemable, cut off from salvation. Instead, just the opposite is implied. Positive soteriological actions are presented as taking place in the realm of the flesh, among the nations and in the world. The hymn emphasizes not that earth is replaced by heaven (or flesh by spirit), but that through the person and work of Christ earth and heaven are united. "Salvation consists in the newly-found unity of the two spheres".⁷⁶

Second, this salvation in I.3.16b is 'universal'. This is antipodal to the Gnostic doctrine that only the elect 'pneumatics' can be recipients of 'gnosis'. In fact, it is important to note that the term which the author has chosen to describe those to whom the gospel is proclaimed is just the converse of 'pneumatics', i.e. ἐσθλὸν. Perhaps this term was selected of set purpose to counter those who wanted to think of Christianity as an esoteric community. R. Bultmann attempts to sidestep this issue by relating line iv to I Peter 3.19 and the preaching to souls in prison. But it has been noted above that this interpretation is unnatural and most unlikely.⁷⁷ Moreover, line v continues this stress on universalism - 'believed on in the world'.

Third, and most important, the Redeemer in Gnostic theology is only the 'means' of revelation, the 'mystagogue' who

^{76.} ^{E. Schweizer} Spirit of God, trans. A.E. Harvey, London, 1960, p. 57.
Cf. also R.P. Martin, "Aspects of Worship", Vox Evangelica, II, London, 1963, p. 25.

^{77.} Supra, pp. 211f. and n. 68.

knows and shows the way to the truth. However, in I.3.16b, it is not the knowledge which he imparts, but Christ himself who is the revelation. He is the subject (of the passive verb) who appears to men and to angels, who is justified and who is proclaimed and believed. Nothing is stated or implied concerning 'gnosis'. Unlike the myth, the subject of I.3.16b does not give man merely an occasion for reflecting on his own situation, realizing his own identity. Instead, the attention is focused outside man (and angel) on the person of the Redeemer himself, not as revealer (in the Gnostic sense) but as revealed, not as enlightener but as the One upon whom light has been shed.

Hence, I.3.16b is at odds with some of the very basic tenets of the Gnostic Redeemer-myth: a) that the world is evil and the goal of salvation is for the spirit to escape from the flesh; b) that salvation is possible only for the elect 'pneumatics' who alone are capable of receiving 'gnosis'; and c) that the Redeemer is viewed primarily as the bringer of 'gnosis'. For these reasons, it is impossible to reconcile the essential thought and content of the two contexts. The most that can be said in favor of the interrelation of I.3.16b and the Gnostic Redeemer-myth is that there are some apparent resemblances in terminology and outward form.

But the problems of this interpretation of I.3.16b do not end here. There is the more fundamental question as to whether there ever was in fact a pre-Christian Gnostic

Redeemer-myth. E. Bevan poses the problem for us:⁷⁸

"...the question may be raised whether primitive Christianity and Gnosticism fitted to Jesus of Nazareth the conception of a Redeemer older than Christianity, a conception which existed originally apart from Him, or whether it was the Christian belief in Jesus which induced the Gnostics to introduce the figure of a Redeemer into a scheme which had originally been framed without one".

Bevan concludes that the second alternative is more probable, that the Gnostic idea of the Redeemer appears to be nothing more than the repetition under Christian influence (the addition of the Redeemer) of the myth of Primal Man.⁷⁹ On the other hand, W. Schmithals concludes that the Gnostic Redeemer-myth was the result of influences quite apart from Christianity. It represents the combination of two 'disparate Mythen' - the Anthropos and the Soter - a blending which was pre-Christian and therefore a source of Christological concepts in the New Testament.⁸⁰ But Schmithals' view leaves unanswered the all-important question - when and by whom was this combination effected?⁸¹

78. Op. Cit., p. 95.

79. Ibid., pp. 95ff. Bevan argues (pp. 100f.): "Now, what strikes one in this Gnostic account of the descent and reascension of the Redeemer is that it is just a reduplication of the Hellenistic story of the soul. Already, wherever the divine spark burned in the souls of men, a heavenly thing had come down somehow through those intervening spheres into this place of darkness: redemption consisted in its return. But in those fragments which we have of Hellenistic theology, unmodified by the influence of Christian faith in a human Person, there is no Redeemer ...And why is he needed? For the possession of Knowledge is enough to enable the soul to regain its heavenly home..."

80. Die Gnosis in Korinth, p. 82f.

81. So R. McL. Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, pp. 27f.

According to H. Anderson, one must be very cautious about postulating Gnostic influence on Christianity in the first century A.D.:

"First, it means that we are participating in the dubious historical method of beginning with phenomena, in this instance first-century, possibly Gnostic phenomena, that are inaccessible and obscure because the documentary evidence is extremely slender, and then out of these trying to understand what lies before us in well-documented form in the New Testament writings...Second, to try to interpret the New Testament out of something that can without reservation be called 'Gnosticism' means subscribing to the improbable hypothesis that the fully-structured Gnostic system of the second century A.D. was already uniformly and unvaryingly present at any given instant in the previous nearly two hundred years".⁸²

-
82. Jesus and Christian Origins, New York, 1964, p. 48. Anderson's comments point to the two very important and complicated problems of method and definition. It is not our purpose to expand this section into a thesis on Gnosticism. But an awareness of these problems is essential in the process of evaluating the Gnostic Redeemer-myth and its relation to I.3.16b.

Concerning 'method', the problem consists in the use of the phenomenological approach apart from historical considerations. According to Th. P. van Baaren ("Towards a definition of Gnosticism", art. in Le Origini dello Gnosticismo, pp. 175f.), the phenomenological approach "has tended in the case of gnosticism to isolate the element of knowledge-that-brings-salvation as the essential characteristic and to speak of gnosticism everywhere where we encounter this element. This makes no sense whatever. The same goes for all elements encountered in gnosticism. Not all elements, if any, to be found in gnosticism can rightly be called gnostic elements". When studying phenomena, the similarities and typical features are noted. But these parallel features do not necessarily guarantee any historical continuity. Furthermore, according to R. McL. Wilson ("Addenda et Postscripta: I", art. in Le Origini dello Gnosticismo, p. 527): "It seems to me that sometimes the phenomenological approach gathers everything in, and puts it all on one level, and then it is a very natural thing to transfer all this back, wherever any particular aspect appears". He is referring, of course, to the danger of reading back into the New Testament elements of second century Gnosticism.

That particular elements in second century Gnosticism can be traced back to a pre-Christian era is not to be doubted. But the essential question remains - when were these diverse elements first combined into a system bearing any real resemblance to the developed theories of a

[Contd.]

Of course, Anderson is referring to the influence of 'Gnosticism' in general. But his comments remain pertinent to an analysis of the Gnostic Redeemer-myth as well. Caution is especially important in view of the wide-spread skepticism among scholars that such a 'Gnostic' Redeemer-myth ever existed in pre-Christian times.⁸³ S. Neill

Contd.] Basilides or a Valentinus? This is the crux of the matter. R. McL. Wilson turns it into a problem of 'definition'. After noting that many scholars have often used the term "Gnosticism" to refer to parallel phenomena in Christian and pre-Christian literature, he writes (Gnosis and the New Testament, pp. 8f.): "One possible solution is to distinguish between Gnosticism on the one hand and Gnosis on the other. By Gnosticism we mean the specifically Christian heresy of the second century A.D., by Gnosis, in a broader sense, the whole complex of ideas belonging to the Gnostic movement and related trends of thought". He also makes the distinction between 'pre-Gnosticism' and 'Gnosticism proper', 'pre-Gnosticism' referring to those themes and motifs, concepts and ideas in the pre-Christian and Christian periods which were preparing the way for the development of 'Gnosticism proper' in the second century. One might also refer to a 'proto-Gnosticism' meaning the essence of Gnosticism proper already in the preceding periods. However, even if scholars would agree to the delimitation of these terms as Wilson suggests, there would still be disagreement as to when and where 'pre-Gnosticism' became 'Gnosticism proper' or 'proto-Gnosticism'. Cf. Le Origini dello Gnosticismo, pp. xxviff.

An awareness of these central problems of method and 'definition' with reference to the study of Gnosticism in general will help us to evaluate better the Gnostic Redeemer-myth. While the phenomenological approach is important when comparing the Redeemer-myth with I.3.16b, the following two points must be kept in mind: a) parallel features do not necessarily guarantee historical continuity; and b) there is a danger of reading back into the New Testament elements of 2nd (and in this case 3rd and 4th) century Gnosticism. Certain features in the New Testament may only be 'preparing' the way for 'Gnosticism proper'.

83. One must distinguish between 'Gnostic' and other 'Redeemer' figures in the ancient world. R. McL. Wilson writes ("Addenda et Postscripta: I", art. in Le Origini dello Gnosticismo, pp. 697f.): "That there were saviours in abundance in the ancient world is well known..., but to what extent are they really comparable to the Christian Jesus? Was there a full-scale redeemer-myth which could be transferred en bloc, or was it simply a case of the adoption by Christianity of particular traits for the presentation of its own Gospel?"

asks:⁸⁴

"Where do we find the evidence for pre-Christian belief in a Redeemer, who descended into the world of darkness in order to redeem the sons of light? Where is the early evidence for the redeemed Redeemer, who himself has to be delivered from death? The surprising answer is that there is precisely no evidence at all. The idea that such a belief existed in pre-Christian times is simply a hypothesis and rests on nothing more than highly precarious inference backwards from a number of documents which themselves are known to be of considerably later origin".

R. McL. Wilson argues:⁸⁵

"The real flaw is the idea that the myth of the Gnostic Redeemer originated at some time in dim antiquity...and then passed across the world and down the centuries, leaving behind scattered fragments in different circles of tradition until at last it was reconstituted as a unity in Manicheism and finally disintegrated into its several components in Mandeism. Rather should we conclude, with H.M. Schenke, that there was no Redeemer-myth in the full sense before Manicheism. It is the climax and the culmination of the long process of development, not its original starting-point".

Scholars such as C. Colpe, G. Quispel and R.M. Grant also agree that it was not the Gnostic Redeemer-myth which influenced Christianity, but Christianity which influenced the myth.⁸⁶

84. Op. Cit., pp. 179f. He also writes (p. 177): "We may maintain, if we will, that such a myth existed more or less in the form in which it is presented to us; but honest caution compels us to recognize that the evidence is far too slender for any confident affirmation to be based on it".

85. Gnosis and the New Testament, p. 28. His reference is to the work of H.M. Schenke, Der Gott 'Mensch' in der Gnosis, Göttingen, 1962, p. 148.

86. C. Colpe ("Gnosis I. Religionsgeschichtlich", Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 3rd ed., Vol. II, 1958, pp. 1648-52; the present quotation trans. by H. Anderson, Jesus and Christian Origins, p. 52) maintains that "while gnosticizing tendencies were certainly present at a pre-Christian stage, the Gnostic redeemer myth has almost certainly arisen out of Docetic interpretation of Christ". See also, idem., Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule, Göttingen, 1961, p. 191. G. Quispel in The Jung Codex (ed. and trans. F.L. Cross, London, 1955, p. 78) writes: "There would appear to be good grounds for supposing that it was

[Contd.]

Even W. Schmithals admits:⁸⁷

"...schon vor der Wende zum 2. Jahrhundert der reine Mythos von Christos als erlöstem Erlöser nirgendwo mehr vertreten wurde".

It is surely legitimate, therefore, to question whether such a 'pure' myth ever existed prior to the Christian era; and this lends further doubt as to whether I.3.16b was patterned after the Gnostic Redeemer-myth. For one is then placed in the precarious situation of having to presuppose that such a myth existed in pre-Christian times when the evidence is very weak.

In conclusion, this analysis proceeded on the assumption that the influence of the Gnostic Redeemer-myth on I.3.16b

Contd.] from Christianity that the concept of redemption and the figure of the divine Redeemer were taken over into Gnosticism". Note also his article in Le Origini dello Gnosticismo, "Makarius und das Lied von der Perle" (pp. 625ff.), in which he argues that the Hymn of the Pearl, which is considered to be a classical example of the Redeemer-myth with its redeemed redeemer, is dependent upon prior Christian concepts. According to R.M. Grant (Gnosticism: An Anthology, pp. 17f.): "The question of the origin of the Gnostic redeemer is remarkably difficult to answer. In pre-Christian Graeco-Roman religion there was no redeemer or saviour of a Gnostic type. There were gods who died and rose again, but they did not give saving knowledge to their followers. There were rites, even rites which provided immortality, but there was no theological explanation of the rites like that which we find in Gnosticism. In Oriental religions redeemers somewhat analogous to the Gnostic ones may have existed, but thus far no one has been able to prove that they were known as such before the rise of Gnostic thought. To some extent the Gnostic redeemer is foreshadowed in the mysterious Teacher of Righteousness of the Dead Sea Scrolls, but the interpretation of his meaning at Qumran did not [appear to] make him more than human. The most obvious explanation of the origin of the Gnostic redeemer is that he was modelled after the Christian conception of Jesus. It seems significant that we know no redeemer before Jesus, while we encounter other redeemers (Simon Magus, Menander) immediately after his time".

87. Op. Cit., p. 111.

could only be discerned by a careful analysis and comparison of their respective contents, and not simply by a comparison of their terminological and formal resemblances. It was inferred that the essential thought and content of I.3.16b was the converse of what one finds in the Gnostic Redeemer-myth as summarized by Bultmann. Moreover, it was noted that by accepting Bultmann's interpretation of I.3.16b, one stands in the precarious position of not even being able to demonstrate that the Gnostic Redeemer-myth existed prior to the Christian era. For these basic reasons, R.P. Martin is justified in concluding that "dependence (of I.3.16b) upon the myth of the Redeemer is very questionable".⁸⁸

3. R.H. Fuller - divine man concept:

According to R.H. Fuller, I.3.16b exhibits a Christology of epiphany which is based on the Hellenistic concept of the

88. "Aspects of Worship", p. 25. In all this, one cannot help but feel that I.3.16b is being manipulated by R. Bultmann in the interests of his theory that the Gnostic Redeemer-myth was an important influence in New Testament Christology. In the section entitled "Gnostic Motifs" in his Theology of the New Testament (I, pp. 164ff.), it would appear that he finds the influence of Gnosticism behind most of New Testament thought; and he finds the Redeemer-myth as the source of most, if not all, of the major Christological statements in the New Testament, and especially in Paul. I.3.16b is for Bultmann simply one of many Christological statements he can claim in support of his major thesis that the Gnostic Redeemer-myth is the basis of New Testament expressions about Christ.

Nevertheless, one must allow for the possibility that certain Christians who were familiar with and/or influenced by the Gnostic interpretation of Christ may have viewed I.3.16b in terms of the Gnostic Redeemer-myth. For, though we may not find resemblances in essential thought and content, those Christians later influenced by Gnosticism may have used this interpretation of the passage by reason of certain terminological and formal similarities.

θεῖος ἄνθρωπος. He writes:⁸⁹

"In I Tim. 3:16, (in contrast to Phil. 2.6ff.)..., only the uniqueness of the incarnate life is stressed, not the features it shared with all men. It is a manifestation of the divine glory. It is not a kenosis but an epiphany. This takes us beyond the Christ myth, and results from a combination of that myth with the concept of the Hellenistic divine man".

What Fuller means by this statement is this. First, by 'Christ-myth', he is referring to the developed Christological pattern of 'pre-existence - incarnation - exaltation' which is so apparent in Phil. 2.6ff. However, in contrast with the emphasis in Phil. 2.6ff. on 'kenosis' and consequently on the Incarnate One becoming like all other men, line 1 of I.3.16b regards his incarnation as an 'epiphany'. Thus, the divine glory is not hidden, but revealed. The stress is not on his humanness, but on his 'uniqueness' as the manifestation of the divine 'in flesh'. This concept, he argues, is thoroughly Hellenistic and is derived from the Hellenistic concept of the 'divine man'. Hence, I.3.16b is a combination of this 'divine man' concept and the 'Christ-myth'. "The redeemer was a divine being who became incarnate, manifested the Deity in his flesh, and was subsequently exalted to heaven".⁹⁰

At issue, here, is not the difficult question of whether the title 'Son of God' or even the New Testament presentation of Jesus as divine came from an Hebraic or an Hellenistic milieu. All that is implied in line 1 of I.3.16b is that the

89. The Foundations of New Testament Christology, London, 1965, p. 217.

90. Ibid., p. 232. By the term 'epiphany', Fuller is apparently thinking in terms analogous to 'theophany'. Therefore, in the analysis to follow, it may be assumed that the use of this term includes these further connotations.

one who 'was manifested in the flesh' was 'pre-existent', and that therefore his manifestation should be considered an 'epiphany' of the divine. The question, therefore, is limited to whether these implications were derived from the context of Hellenism and the Hellenistic 'divine man'.

Fuller argues that the implications of line i are irreconcilable with Judaic transcendental-monotheism. Therefore, they must have been influenced by the Hellenistic 'divine man' concept. This argument is very convincing. That God would appear 'in flesh' was, in the words of H.J. Schoeps,⁹¹

"a dogmatic impossibility from the standpoint of strict Jewish transcendent monotheism. Judaism of every tendency, both before and contemporary with Paul - even Hellenistic (cf. LXX Is. 63:9) - rejected any compromise. Thus in the last analysis,...the Christian doctrine of the incarnation must be utterly repudiated on the ground of the Jewish experience of God: that God as the formless cannot be embodied in any kind of form, that He as the Infinite, prior to all forms, was the Creator of every form".

Aside from the Jewish standpoint, the idea of man being affiliated with the divine was extremely widespread in the ancient world. The distinction between the divine and human was blurred, and there were many men who asserted their claim to deity. It was in this climate of thought that the Hellenistic concept of 'divine man' thrived. According to R. Bultmann:⁹²

91. Paul, London, 1961, pp. 166f. In this regard, see also C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge, 1970, pp. 250ff.; O. Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, trans. C. Guthrie and A.M. Hall, London, 1963, p. 302; and F. Hahn, The Titles of Jesus in Christology, trans. H. Knight and G. Ogg, London, 1969, p. 289.

92. Theology, I, p. 130. Note also this statement by H.D. Betz ("Jesus as Divine Man", Jesus and the Historian, ed. F.T. Trotter, Philadelphia, 1968, p. 116): "Man in this concept is not simply what he is, but he is a being hovering between his two possibilities, the divine (θεῖον) and the animal (ἄνθρωπος). Only the Divine Man is man in the full sense: [Contd.]

"The Hellenistic period knows a whole series of such 'divine men' (θεῖοι ἄνδρες), who claimed to be sons of (a) god or were regarded as such, and some of whom were also cultically worshiped. In their case, there is no emphasis, or almost none, on the paradoxicality of the divine appearing in human form; moreover, this was no problem at all to Greek thinking in general, for which everyman's soul is a divine entity. Hence, here the interest lies not in the (paradoxical) fact of the divine son's humanity but in the content of his life (βίος) marked by miracles and other divinely conferred phenomena".

The extent to which this idea of the 'divine man' was present in the ancient world and especially in Hellenistic syncretism has been graphically described by H. Windisch and L. Bieler.⁹³ The world was full of 'divine men' and, according to Fuller, it was from this Hellenistic fusion of the human with the divine that the Christology of line i was derived.

But what does the evidence suggest? On the one hand, it is important to note that certain primary aspects of the Hellenistic 'divine man' concept are absent from line i: namely, the mention of his metaphysical origin and/or divine essence;⁹⁴

Contd.] then his humanity becomes the epiphany of the divine. He is exceptionally gifted and extraordinary in every respect. He is in command both of a higher, revelational wisdom and of the divine power (δύναμις) to do miracles. Yet he is not identical with a deity, but can be called 'a mixture of the human and the divine', 'a higher being', or 'superhuman'. Depending on the religiohistorical context, the concept of Divine Man is open to considerable variation. For references to these designations of the divine man in ancient literature, see the notes accompanying this statement, p. 131, nn. 7-10.

93. H. Windisch, Paulus und Christus, Leipzig, 1934, pp. 24-89; L. Bieler, Θεῖος Ἄνθρωπος, 2 Vols., Wien, 1935-6 (reprinted in Darmstadt, 1967); also H. Braun, "The Meaning of New Testament Christology", God and Christ. Journal for Theology and the Church, V, New York, 1968, pp. 104ff.; C.H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 250ff.; H. Kleinknecht, Θεῖος, TDNT, III, p. 122; M. Hadas and M. Smith, Heroes and Gods, London, 1965.

94. Fuller's whole thesis stands or falls on what is implicit in line i rather than on what is explicit. 'Pre-existence' and 'epiphany' (theophany) are implicit, whereas his 'appearance in flesh' is explicit. By emphasizing what is implicit, Fuller finds that line i is primarily a statement

[Contd.]

his ability to work miracles and to demonstrate power; and his reception on earth as a 'hero'. In fact, the 'glory' which Christ received is not mentioned until line vi; and ἐδικαιώθη in line ii would suggest that his manifestation in line i was received not by acclamation and glory but by accusations and rejection.⁹⁵

Contd.] about Christ's divine being, an ontological statement characteristic of those made of the Hellenistic 'divine men'. But is this the case in line i? It would appear on the surface that ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί is concerned with what he did, rather than what he was. If his divinity is implied, it is not from the presence of any ontological statement but from the implications of his appearing in the flesh together with his consequent vindication and exaltation. *Infra*, pp. 274ff.

Fuller maintains that a distinction is to be made between the Hellenistic-Judaic mission which thought in functional terms, and the Hellenistic-Gentile mission which tended to exchange functional statements for ontological ones, or at least to include ontological concepts in their Christology. For example, Fuller distinguishes between that type of pre-existence in which the Son is inactive, and that type of pre-existence in which the Son actively plays a role in initiating his own incarnation. In the former, the "intention is not to speculate about the Redeemer's pre-existence, but to assert that the historical mission of Jesus rests on the divine initiative" (pp. 194-5). But if we use this distinction as a guideline, then I.3.16b would appear to fit into the former category. For while pre-existence may be implied in line i, there is certainly no implication here that the 'pre-existent One' was active in any way prior to his appearance in flesh. Hence, by using Fuller's own guidelines, one finds that line i of I.3.16b does not fit into the pattern (if there is one) of later Hellenistic speculation on the pre-existence of the Son.

95. *Supra*, pp. 115ff., 142f. R.H. Gundry (*Op. Cit.*, p. 220) further notes: "Nor is the use of φανερώω in line i distinctively Hellenistic, for (to take but one example) it occurs in I Peter 1.20 concerning Christ's first advent in a context very Hebraic in style and content".

On the other hand, one has to account for the implications of 'pre-existence' and 'epiphany' (theophany) in line 1. Both ideas appear to be foreign to pure Hebraic monotheism. That Judaism was able to assimilate the concept of pre-existence by the New Testament era is evident in its development of the figure of Wisdom and similar concepts. However, as H.J. Schoeps has shown, the idea of epiphany ἐν σαρκί was really 'a dogmatic impossibility' even for the Hellenistic Jew.⁹⁶ Does this mean, therefore, that Fuller is correct in finding the origin of this concept in Hellenism and the Hellenistic 'divine man'? Fuller writes:⁹⁷

"In two of the christological hymns, I Tim. 3:16 and John 1:1-14, there occurs, as we have seen, a new conception of the incarnate life as an epiphany. It was suggested that this new conception was influenced by the Hellenistic conception of the divine man".

Was this idea of 'epiphany' a later accretion in New Testament Christology brought about through contact with the Hellenistic world?

The similarity of concepts cannot be denied. But the process by which the New Testament Church came to think of Christ in terms of 'epiphany' is not necessarily along the lines Fuller outlines. Fuller maintains that the Church's Christology was developed in three stages - the Palestinian-Judaic, Hellenistic-Judaic and Hellenistic-Gentile. He asserts that the concept of 'epiphany' was a 'new' conception in the last stage of this development, the Hellenistic-Gentile mission.⁹⁸

96. Supra, p. 225.

97. Op. Cit., pp. 227f.

98. Note carefully his quote immediately above.

However, this is not necessarily the case.

First, it is doubtful that the clear kind of distinction which Fuller makes between the Palestinian-Judaic, Hellenistic-Judaic and Hellenistic-Gentile stages can be consistently maintained.⁹⁹ As the introduction of this chapter observes, recent studies have demonstrated that the first century A.D. was an age of flux. Religious concepts crossed geographical boundaries and in the process concepts were modified, adapted and sometimes changed. Therefore, a 'conveyor-belt' type of development in which Christianity progressed in a linear and evolutionary pattern cannot be assumed.

It is in recognition of this principle that Fuller makes a most significant concession, and in doing so seems to contradict his basic thesis concerning the 'divine man'. After describing near the end of his work the history of 'epiphany' Christology, he concludes that although the concept of 'divine man' eventually won acceptance in Christendom, it had experienced "a profound transformation". Then he goes on to suggest that its representative elements - "namely his exousia and his conveyance of a direct confrontation with the revelatory presence and saving action of God himself" - were present from

99. For clear summaries and critical reviews of Fuller's three-stage Christology, see the following reviews: R.S. Barbour, *SJT*, 20 (1967) pp. 239ff.; W.A. Meeks, *Interpretation*, 21 (1967) pp. 188ff.; and N. Perrin, *The Journal of Religion*, 46 (1966) pp. 491ff. Note especially W.A. Meek's criticism of Fuller's rigid three-stage scheme (p. 190), together with Barbour's comment (pp. 244f.): "In his laudable desire to paint a clear and consistent picture of the early growth of Christology the author has perhaps drawn his distinctions too sharply, and made straight lines and angles where there should be curves and recesses".

the very beginning of the Church, and that the 'divine man' concept was primarily used as a vehicle to express these elements in the Hellenistic-Gentile mission. This stands in complete contrast to the opening statement of the same section quoted above (p. 228) in which the 'newness' of the 'epiphany' concept in the Hellenistic-Gentile stage is stressed.¹⁰⁰

It is hard to understand how Fuller can justify this inconsistency. But we would agree that the 'epiphany' aspect of the incarnation of Christ might very likely have been present from the beginning of Christendom. For instance, both H.J. Schoeps and O. Cullmann have argued persuasively that the Jews sought to have Jesus crucified because of his claim to a unique relationship with God as his Father. In the Old Testament there are references to 'sons of God'. But these -

100. Perhaps a weakness of Fuller's entire presentation (in this writer's view) is his failure to make absolutely clear whether he considered the 'tools' ("the terms, images, concepts and patterns which the church picked up and used for its christological response", derived from the three successive environments of Palestinian-Judaism, Hellenistic-Judaism and the Graeco-Roman world - p. 16) as the 'raw-material' from which Christological concepts were derived, or simply the means at hand by which the Church was able to convey their understanding of Christ to the respective environments. As an example, reference may be made to his understanding of the Church's use of the 'divine man' concept. On the one hand, he talks about "the tradition of Jesus' miracles" taking on "some of the traits of the Hellenistic divine man" (p. 98; cf. *idem.*, Interpreting the Miracles, London, 1963, pp. 48-68), and about its "influence" (p. 69) in early Christianity. But, on the other hand, he finds that in the Hellenistic-Judaic mission the 'divine man' concept was so modified by Old Testament tradition that it was only "a contribution of form rather than content" (p. 72). But how is the form to be separated from the content of the 'divine man' concept? Perhaps Fuller is equating 'form' with the 'functional' and 'content' with the 'ontological' aspects of the concept. But if this is the case, then why does he speak of a

[Contd.]

whether with reference to angels, or righteous men, or kings, or Israel - were always thought of in a purely metaphorical sense. But the Jews identified Jesus' claim to 'sonship' with the blasphemous ideas typical of the Θεῶν ἀΐδρες of Hellenism. It was for this blasphemy that they felt compelled to encompass his death.¹⁰¹ If this is the case, then Jesus, a Palestinian Jew, was acquainted with and adapted a concept similar to the Hellenistic 'divine man', for which he was crucified. But his resurrection from the dead would have vindicated the uniqueness of his relationship with the Father, and it would have been from that moment on in history (at the latest) that the New Testament community was conscious of the 'epiphany' aspect of his life (including his resurrection appearances).

Therefore, it is better to suspend judgment as to the circumstances surrounding the origin of the 'epiphany' concept in New Testament Christology (hence, also in I.3.16b). That it is a distinctively Christian concept in contrast to Judaism appears evident. That it is to some extent similar to the Hellenistic 'divine man' is apparent. But this does not mean

Contd.] 'miracle tradition' (p. 98) which was separate from the 'divine-man' concept? It is all rather confusing, but this would tend to happen whenever such clear-cut geographic-cultural distinctions are made prior to exegesis with a view to being the guidelines, come what may, to exegesis.

101. Schoeps, Op. Cit., pp. 149-67, esp. pp. 160ff.; Cullmann, Christology, pp. 272-305, esp. p. 302. The latter scholar argues that there are reasons to doubt that the designation of 'Son of God' as applied to Jesus by the Church came either from the Old Testament or from Hellenism. Then he asks (p. 279) whether this does not compel us to think seriously about the possibility that the Church's conception of Jesus as the 'Son of God' goes back to Jesus himself.

that the idea of 'epiphany' was necessarily 'a later accretion in New Testament Christology brought about through contact with the Hellenistic world'. It could very well have been part of the Christological tradition from the beginning of Christendom.

However, there is also the possibility that, where the 'epiphany' aspect of the incarnation is stressed in the New Testament (as in the Gospel of John) together with the display of his power, etc., this emphasis was in part due to the Church's attempt to expound the significance of Jesus in an Hellenistic context. This aspect of Christ's coming was a stumbling-block to Jews, but it would have made sense to Gentile audiences. For this reason, the implications of 'pre-existence' and 'epiphany' in line i may be taken to indicate that the form was written with the Hellenistic Christian community in mind. Also, one cannot discount the possibility that certain members of the Hellenistic community, when reciting the form, may have thought in terms of the Hellenistic 'divine man'.¹⁰²

4. E. Schweizer - Hellenistic-spatial concepts:¹⁰³

In his Lordship and Discipleship, E. Schweizer has no difficulty in illustrating from Jewish sources the existence

102. One must be careful to maintain the distinction here between the author and his audience as clarified in the introduction to this chapter,

103. The following section assumes the reader's acquaintance with the summary of Schweizer's interpretation of I.3.16b above, Chap. I, pp. 52ff.

of a rather generalized pattern of lowly suffering followed by some manner of exaltation of 'the Righteous One'. It was thought that the life of a pious man would be marked by humiliation and suffering:¹⁰⁴

"Judaism frequently speaks of the righteous one who humbles himself or who voluntarily accepts humiliation by suffering and death in obedience to God. Suffering in particular is very valuable as atonement for one's own sins or vicarious atonement for other people's. As a reward the righteous one is exalted by God, secretly already on earth, but especially in the world to come, where he finds his seat reserved for him in heaven, the throne of glory, and there acts as a judge and executioner. This exaltation can also be pictured physically as an assumption from the earth, as an ascension to heaven".

Schweizer goes on to suggest that Jesus understood his course in a manner analogous to this succession of the suffering and exaltation of 'the Righteous One'. Indeed, the early Christian community portrayed Jesus as the unique, eschatological Righteous One who fulfilled the past and brought in the kingdom of God.¹⁰⁵

This concept of humiliation/exaltation made sense to the Jewish Christians who found in Christ the assurance of pardon for their sins of which they were convicted. By "following" Jesus, they were freed from their burden of sin. But this was not a burning issue for the Hellenistic man, according to Schweizer. The Hellenist was worried about the demonic powers and forces over which he had no control. If only he could be

104. London, 1960, pp. 22ff., esp. p. 30. Note also, *idem.*, Erniedrigung und Erhöhung, Zürich, 1965, sec. 5. A brief sketch of the thesis of these books may be found in NTS 2 (1955-6), pp. 87-99, a lecture by Schweizer, translated by H.F. Peacock and entitled, "Discipleship and Belief in Jesus as Lord from Jesus to the Hellenistic Church".

105. Lordship and Discipleship, pp. 32ff.

liberated from their control and participate in the upper, godly world, this was his desire.¹⁰⁶

Hence, the early Church had to adjust its Judaic concept of Jesus as the humiliated/exalted, eschatological Righteous One to allow for the questions being raised in the Hellenistic mission. This meant a change of emphasis from Jesus as the 'suffering and humiliated Righteous One' who died and whom God raised from the dead, to Jesus as the 'Exalted One' who triumphed over the demonic forces and thereby secured passage to heaven. Instead of the Judaic-temporal idea of Jesus as the 'eschatological Righteous One' come in the fullness of time, the Hellenistic-spatial idea of Jesus as coming down from and going back up to the world of God came into vogue.¹⁰⁷ By "following" Jesus, the Gentile Christian was assured that he was liberated from the demonic spirit-powers and with Jesus would participate in and experience the glory of God.

E. Schweizer demonstrates this shift of emphasis by contrasting the two traditional Christological forms, I.3.16b and I Cor. 15.3ff.¹⁰⁸ He notes that their themes are entirely different for they are attempting to answer two different sets of questions. I Cor. 15.3ff. is answering the question: "How may I get rid of my sins?" I Tim. 3.16b is answering:

106. Cf. esp. E. Schweizer's Lordship and Discipleship, pp. 104ff. An excellent summary of the Hellenistic ideas of salvation together with a wide assortment of bibliographical material may be found in R.P. Martin's Carmen Christi, pp. 306-9.

107. Cf. E. Schweizer, "Two New Testament Creeds Compared", Neotestamentica, Zürich/Stuttgart, 1963, pp. 129ff.

108. The following comments are taken directly (in quotations) or indirectly from his article in Neotestamentica, pp. 128-9.

"How may I be freed from the powers of a blind fate? How may I obtain access to the heavenly, divine world?" Consequently the former represents Jesus as "the eschatological fulfiller of God's Heilsgeschichte", using the Judaic concepts "of atoning death and resurrection". But the latter presents Jesus as the exalted Lord "in whom heaven and earth are reunited", speaking "in terms of incarnation and exaltation". While the former uses temporal concepts, the latter uses spatial. Thus in I.3.16b we find the 'humiliation/exaltation' pattern expressed in terms of space - the spheres of earth and heaven - thereby suggesting the background for its interpretation.¹⁰⁹

In his analysis of the structure of I.3.16b, Schweizer strengthens his interpretation by demonstrating that the entire form has been constructed on the chiasmic scheme a-b/b-a/a-b. Each couplet contrasts the two spheres of existence

-
109. It should also be noted that Schweizer observes certain similarities between I Cor. 15.3ff. and I.3.16b. The sole content of both forms is Jesus Christ; he is the subject of all verbs, though the passive voice reminds one of God acting in him. These distinctions between the Judaic-eschatological and the Hellenistic-cosmological concepts are drawn out to a greater extent in Schweizer's comparison of I Cor. 15.3ff. and Phil. 2.6ff. (Lordship and Discipleship, pp. 114-6):
- i - His humanity is obvious, and is therefore the natural startingpoint in I Cor. 15.3f.; his humanity is considered miraculous, is part of the creed, and his equality with God is the starting point in Phil. 2.6ff.
 - ii - His resurrection is the concluding statement; his Lordship over all concludes the thought.
 - iii - The Church recognizes the phrase "for our sins"; the Church is singing a hymn of exaltation.
 - iv - The question is of sin; the question is of meaninglessness, fate, powerlessness.
 - v - The answer is the death of Jesus; the answer is the exaltation of Jesus.
 - vi - The emphasis is on "for us"; the emphasis is on "with Him".

(Seinssphären), the one below and the one above, the preposition by being used as a locative and not instrumentally.

Thus, his confident conclusions:¹¹⁰

"This church thinks no more in a pattern of time and history. It is exclusively by images of space that she expresses her feelings, her problems and needs, as well as the answer which she found in Jesus Christ...Her problem is not sin. It is rather a feeling of being imprisoned in a world which is hostile, terrifying and meaningless -- in a world where one is totally separated from God and his world...Thus the uniqueness and pre-eminence of Christ over all other beings in heaven and on earth are expressed without any special reflection, in terms of space, because this was the natural worldview accepted by this congregation".

But are these conclusions sound? Is Schweizer justified in saying that the Church of I.3.16b "thinks no more in a pattern of time...Her problem is not sin"? Should we accept that the prominence of the spatial motif reflects a Hellenistic congregation?

E. Schweizer maintains, as does R.H. Fuller,¹¹¹ that in the Hellenistic world and in Palestine there were two quite different and distinct mentalities. But unlike Fuller, he does not go to Hellenistic images and patterns of thought to

110. Neotestamentica, pp. 125-6; this writer is responsible for the underlining of the text. Note also Schweizer's argument from the order of the lines, found in his Lordship and Discipleship, p. 66; "We no longer find a strictly chronological order of the successive saving events. The two first lines summarize the work of salvation as a whole; the two next lines maintain that the act of salvation and the proclamation of the gospel belong together; and finally by the last two lines the singing Church praises the victory of the Saviour in logical (not chronological) order. Here the important point is only that heaven and earth have become one again". For his formal analysis of I.3.16b, see the following: Neotestamentica, pp. 125f.; Erniedrigung und Erhöhung, pp. 62f.; Lordship and Discipleship, pp. 64f.; and Spirit of God, (TDNT), London, 1960, pp. 56f.

111. For Fuller's view, supra, pp. 225f., 228ff., esp. nn. 94, 99f. It was Fuller who coined the term 'tools'.

find the 'tools' which the early Church used in its Hellenistic mission to express its faith. Instead, these 'tools' as a whole were already present in Palestine. The problem of the Church was to re-interpret these 'tools' so that they would be meaningful in a Hellenistic context. But note the difficulty this raises for Schweizer in his interpretation of I.3.16b. On the one hand, he leaves the impression, sometimes explicitly stated, that the 'tools' in this text - the humiliation/exaltation motif,¹¹² the use of σάρξ and πνεῦμα designating two spheres of existence,¹¹³ the use of ἐδουλωθή¹¹⁴ and the chiastic pattern¹¹⁵ - originated in Judaic, not in Hellenistic thought. On the other hand, these 'tools' are used in such a way in I.3.16b that all trace of their etymology is removed. The form is to be interpreted only through Hellenistic spectacles. But if the Hellenization of these Judaic concepts had gone so far, one wonders whether the distinctions Schweizer makes here are meaningful? Moreover, it must be asked whether such a cross-breed ever existed? Was it possible that the form could have been so 'hellenized' that it could have had no relevance for the Palestinian-Jewish Christians and no meaningful Jewish connotations for the Hellenistic-Gentile Christians?

Such a phenomenon is difficult to imagine, especially in view of the cross-currents of thought between Palestine and

112. Lordship and Discipleship, pp. 22ff.; NTS, 2 (1955-6) p. 98.

113. Neotestamentica, p. 125; cf. also his article on "σάρξ", FDNT, VII, pp. 109f., 123f.; NTS, 2 (1955-6) p. 98.

114. Lordship and Discipleship, p. 65, and n. 2.

115. Neotestamentica, pp. 125f., and p. 126, n. 7.

the Hellenistic world by the first century A.D.¹¹⁶ There are numerous indications both in the literature of that period and in I.3.16b that such fine distinctions between Palestinian and Hellenistic mentalities as Schweizer has described never existed. On the one hand, Schweizer himself has provided ample evidence that the spatial contrast between earth and heaven is not distinctively Hellenistic at all, but is found in the Old Testament, LXX, Jewish apocryphal and pseud-epigraphical literature, as well as in later rabbinical tradition. Thus it is not at all certain that the spatial contrast in I.3.16b had no relevance for the Palestinian-Jewish Christians.¹¹⁷ On the other hand, if the Judaic concepts of eschatology and soteriology were unintelligible to the Gentile Christians, then much of the material written by 'the Apostle to the Gentiles' was irrelevant to the majority of its readers. Surely this was not the case. Even in the few lines of I.3.16b where spatial images predominate, there is evidence of an awareness of these Judaic concepts. For in the linguistic

116. In regard to the widespread interchange of ideas in the first century, supra, pp. 183ff. It is important to note that, in principle, Schweizer (Neotestamentica article, p. 131) would agree with this point: "There was never anything like a purely Hebrew or a purely Hellenistic creed". But apparently he does not take this statement seriously or else he would not have made the conclusions which have already been quoted above from the same article.

117. "Σαίς" article, pp. 109f.; Spirit of God, p. 58; "Röm. 1, 3f., und der Gegensatz von Fleisch und Geist vor und bei Paulus", Neotestamentica, Zürich/Stuttgart, pp. 180f. See R.H. Gundry (Op. Cit., p. 217 and n. 2), who goes into more detail in his criticism of Schweizer's view in this regard.

analysis above, it became evident not only that Judaic-eschatological ideas may have played a supporting role in the order of the lines,¹¹⁸ but also that Judaic-soteriological ideas could have been present as 'overtones of meaning' in the recitation of the form.¹¹⁹ Moreover, it is clear that the spatial contrast in I.3.16b is not so strong as Schweizer would suppose. In fact, in lines iii and iv it is only inferred from the location of the persons involved (angels and nations); and throughout the form, the dative nouns connote both spatial and personal nuances.¹²⁰

Therefore, it is felt that one cannot dogmatically assert that the Church of I.3.16b "thinks no more in a pattern of time...Her problem is not sin". There is no compelling reason why the form should be viewed as 'thoroughly' hellenized in this way. Nevertheless, Schweizer's analysis does focus attention on the following important points: chronology is not a significant factor, whereas the spatial contrast is. Neither the death nor the resurrection of Christ are specifically mentioned, whereas his exaltation is (line vi). There is no specific reference to "for our sins" in I.3.16b, whereas mention appears to be made of his triumph over the 'spirit-powers'. These facts, together with R.H. Fuller's insight into

118. Supra, pp. 100ff., 171ff.; also infra, pp. 174ff.

119. Supra, pp. 172ff.

120. Supra, pp. 171f. See also the arguments of R.H. Gundry, Op. Cit., pp. 217f.

the epiphany aspect of line 1,¹²¹ would suggest with Schweizer that the form was written with an Hellenistic congregation in view. For the Hellenistic-Christian community was, to be sure, concerned about the demonic forces which controlled this world. It was, no doubt, more significant for them than for their Jewish counterparts that Christ was exalted as Lord over these 'spirit-powers'. Hence, our 'Bekenntnis-lied' would reflect that relief and joy which must have been experienced by those Hellenistic-Christians who found in Christ One who took away their feeling of paralysed anxiety (their 'Weltangst') by triumphing over these superior cosmic forces.

But if the form reflects an Hellenistic setting, why is there evidence in it of Judaic concepts such as ἐδουλώθη, the chiastic pattern, etc.? Were these Judaic concepts impregnated in the hymn by those who formulated it; or were the Judaic overtones caught by the Hellenistic congregations which recited the form? These questions will be dealt with in more detail below in Section 6 and the Conclusion of this Chapter.

121. Note the summary of Fuller's view above, pp. 223-232. Schweizer, with his interpretation of 'humiliation' in line 1, does not necessarily rule out a nuance of epiphany. J.M. Robinson (A New Quest of the Historical Jesus, London, 1968, p. 53 and n. 1) thinks this is the case, and wants to direct Schweizer's attention to the "dialectic within the humiliation line" itself. But the following statement by Schweizer (Neotestamentica, p. 126; cf. idem., "σάβ", TDNT, pp. 137f.) would suggest that he is a divine being whose appearance in the flesh is in itself a miracle*.

5. W. Stenger - Judaic-spatial concepts:

For W. Stenger, the underlying schematic principle of I.3.16b is found in the spatial contrast throughout the form "von oben und unten, von irdisch und himmlisch".¹²² But in contrast to the conclusion of E. Schweizer, he regards this contrast as reflecting not a Hellenistic but a Judaic background, and the description of Christ in I.3.16b as reflecting the figure of Wisdom found in Jewish Wisdom literature. His reasons may be summarized as follows.

As Israel's experience with the outside world broadened, especially during and following the Exile, her concept of God developed significantly. Not only was He the God of Israel, but also the God of the Universe. He was the "Schöpfergott"; and in concepts borrowed from their oriental neighbors, "er wohnt 'oben' über der von ihm erschaffenen Welt".¹²³ That these concepts developed within the Old Testament and Judaism may be evidence by tracing the development therein of the antithesis of $\aleph \psi \zeta$ and $\aleph \eta \eta$. In Isaiah 31.3, there is the following contrast between the human and the divine:¹²⁴

"The Egyptians are man and not God,
and their horses flesh and not spirit".

This distinction between $\aleph \psi \zeta$ and $\aleph \eta \eta$ led little by little to a distinction between the world of flesh and the world of

122. "Der Christushymnus in I Tim. 3, 16: Aufbau - Christologie - Sitz im Leben", Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift, 78 (1, 1969) p. 45. The following discussion of his view stems largely from pp. 37f. and 45f. of the article.

123. Ibid., p. 45.

124. Cp. Jer. 17.5-7f.

spirits. This is especially evident in the LXX translation of Numbers 16.22 (and 27.16):

Heb. - 'The God of the spirits which animate all flesh'

LXX - 'The God of the spirits and of all flesh'

Then in the Wisdom literature, due to emphasis upon the transcendence of God, one finds immer stärker sphärischen Sinn' in the contrast of flesh and spirit so that they must be translated 'realm of flesh' and 'realm of divine spirit'.

W. Stenger continues:¹²⁵

"Diese räumlichen Kategorien mitsamt dem Schöpfungsgedanken konnten aber in ausgezeichneter Weise die schon immer erfahrene, unerwältigende Macht Jahwes, seine Andersheit und seine Transzendenz deutlich machen. Hier liegen die wahren Wurzeln für das Schema des Hymnus, nicht im gnostischen Hellenismus".

However, undue emphasis on the transcendence of God ran counter to the basic Jewish belief in the nearness and accessibility of God. Therefore, to fill this ever-expanding gap between God in heaven and man on earth, it became necessary to think in terms of a 'mediator'. This role was partly filled by the progressive personifying and hypostatizing of the divine attribute of 'wisdom', so that by the time the Similitudes of Enoch (I Enoch 37-71) were collected, 'Wisdom' is described as having an existence separate from God and as having descended to earth and reascended to heaven (42.1f.):

Wisdom found no place where she might dwell;
Then a dwelling-place was assigned her in the heavens.
Wisdom went forth to make her dwelling among the children
And found no dwelling-place. of men,
Wisdom returned to her place,
And took her seat among the angels.

125. Op. Cit., p. 45. Note W.D. Davies' descriptive account of the development of the idea of the transcendence of God in Jewish thought in his Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 163ff.

The first half of this pattern is also found in Sirach 24. 2ff. where Wisdom descends to earth to dwell in Jerusalem.

For Stenger, therefore, this understanding of the Jewish account of the descent and ascent of the figure of Wisdom to bridge the gap between God in heaven and man on earth constitutes the background for the scheme in I.3.16b. In support of this view, one may point to the locative use of ἐν οὐρανῷ and ἐν πνεύματι in lines i and ii; to the reference to angels (as in I Enoch 42.2) in line iii; to the 'universalism' of lines iv and v (as coming from the realization that God is the Creator of the Universe); and to δοξα in line vi (which Wisdom shared with God).¹²⁶

But it is doubtful that this point of view can be maintained. First, it may be noted that the consensus of opinion among scholars today is that the figure of Wisdom, especially as it is presented in Sir. 24.2ff and I Enoch 42.1f, is largely a product of foreign influence. According to W.D. Davies:¹²⁷

"Wisdom as found in the Old Testament is in no sense a 'nationalistic' figure. There is about all the Wisdom literature of the Old Testament an international flavour, there is in it nothing that is specifically Israelite".

126. It is interesting that Stenger (Op. Cit., pp. 38, 41) only utilizes the first and third points here expressed. Also, it is strange that he insists that there is no reference to pre-existence in line i (p. 36), a view not consistent with late Wisdom speculation. For references in the Wisdom literature to the relation of Wisdom and δοξα, cf. Wisdom of Solomon, 7.25f.; 9.11; also Sir. 4.11-13.

127. Op. Cit., p. 168. W.O.E. Oesterley (An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha, London, 1935, p. 55) also contends that "it was only after Greek influence began to be felt that the deeper speculation arose". He also notes (pp. 43f.) that Jewish Wisdom literature was to a large extent comprised of wisdom originating from, and held in common with, other lands: "national boundaries offered no obstacles to the interplay of thought between like-minded men who were concerned with matters of general human interest".

Davies goes on to point out that when the figure of Wisdom becomes identified with the Torah (as in the passage in Sir. 24.2ff., 23; also Baruch 4.1), it is probably a deliberate attempt to make more Jewish what previously was 'altogether too foreign'. This view is supported by H. Conzelmann's recent analysis of Sir. 24.2ff.¹²⁸ W.L. Knox argues,¹²⁹

"that the personal Wisdom appears quite suddenly in Judaism and is obviously interpolated, that she is entirely alien to the whole tradition of post-exilic Judaism, and that she represents some literary convention which the compiler or author regards as something given, with which he must comply".

There are some scholars, notably J. Marcus and R.N. Whybray,¹³⁰ who find that the figure of Wisdom in Proverbs 8.22-31 is nothing more than a poetic personification of an attribute of God which, therefore, contains no mythical allusions which may be attributed to extraneous influence. But they do so only by arguing that the terms used to describe Wisdom's origin and relation to God are metaphorical. It is clear that similar arguments for the two passages cited by Stenger - Sir. 24.2ff and I Enoch 42.1f. - cannot be sustained. For Wisdom is plainly hypostatized, having to do

128. "The Mother of Wisdom", The Future of our Religious Past, ed. J.M. Robinson, London, 1971, pp. 230ff.

129. "The Divine Wisdom", JTS, 38 (1937) pp. 230ff., esp. p. 232. Knox traces the development of the concept of Wisdom in Hellenistic Judaism in his St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, Cambridge, 1939, chap. 3, esp. pp. 62f. Cf. also O.S. Rankin, Israel's Wisdom Literature, Edinburgh, 1936 (reprinted, 1964), chap. 9, esp. pp. 228f.

130. J. Marcus, "On Biblical Hypostases of Wisdom", HUCA, 23 (1950-51), vol. I, pp. 157-171; R.N. Whybray, Wisdom in Proverbs, London, 1965, esp. chap. 4 and his conclusion on p. 103. Note also the article by R.B.Y. Scott, "Wisdom in Creation: The 'AMON of Proverbs 8.30", Vetus Testamentum, 10 (1960), pp. 213-223.

with a distinct personality, separate from God.¹³¹ This idea, together with the speculation of the mediation between God and man by a pre-existent, divine, feminine being who descends to earth and goes back again, is not easily explained as a development from within Hebraic monotheism. More probable is the view that certain of these motifs are due to extraneous religious influence.¹³²

Second, though there is no difficulty in viewing the contrast of the human and the divine in Isaiah 31.3 as Hebraic,¹³³ we may observe that it was the LXX which changed the original

-
131. That there was a process of hypostatizing taking place in Intertestamental Judaism with the divine attribute of wisdom is generally accepted. But the exact point at which the figure of Wisdom moves beyond 'poetic personification' to 'hypostatization' is keenly debated. If the two categories are polarized, then 'poetic personification' may be thought of as an abstraction made personal for the sake of poetic vividness; whereas, 'hypostatization' is an actual heavenly being. H. Ringgren (Word and Wisdom, Lund, 1947, p. 8) finds this definition too narrow, and suggests that 'hypostatization' should have the wider meaning of a divine reality only half independent from God, occupying an intermediate position between abstraction and complete personification. But in either case, the figure of Wisdom in Sir. 24.2ff. and I Enoch 42.1f. is no doubt hypostatized.
132. Many places have been suggested for the origin of the biblical figure of Wisdom. For a survey, cf. G. Fohrer and U. Wilckens, art. "σοφία", TDNT, VII, pp. 465-528, esp. pp. 489ff. and 507ff.; H. Conzelmann, Op. Cit., pp. 230ff.; H. Ringgren, Op. Cit., pp. 128ff. For a survey of literature pertaining to the Wisdom literature as a whole, see especially the article by R.B.Y. Scott, "The Study of the Wisdom Literature", Interpretation, 24 (1970) pp. 20-45, esp. pp. 43f. Not included in his survey of literature are the following important works: W. McKane, Proverbs, Part I - "International Wisdom", London, 1970; J. Goodwin, Divine Wisdom, London, 1963; the works by W.L. Knox, R.N. Whybray and H. Conzelmann mentioned above in nn. 71-3; an article by J.M. Robinson, "Logoi Sophon: on the Gattung of Q", The Future of our Religious Past, ed. by J.M. Robinson, London, 1971; also the entire issue of Interpretation, 24 (1970).
133. With reference to the separation of the human and the divine in Hebraic thought, supra, pp. 190ff., 225, 228ff.

Hebraic sense of Numbers 16.22 (27.16) so that the distinction between the world of flesh and the world of spirits occurred. Also, although the increased use of spatial categories in the biblical Wisdom literature may be viewed as a development within Judaism coincident with the undue emphasis on the transcendence of God, it is questionable whether this development can be viewed apart from extraneous influence. For the increased use of these concepts developed simultaneously with Judaism's growing contact with the surrounding world. Moreover, it is generally accepted that "the literary forms, ideas, motifs, and emphases of the biblical Wisdom books were not peculiarly Hebrew".¹³⁴ These intercultural phenomena were shared with the surrounding world. This is especially true with reference to the contrast of spatial spheres, which appears to be prominent not in Hebraic but in Hellenistic modes of thought. Therefore, it is probable that Judaism has Hellenism to thank for much of the increased emphasis in her Wisdom literature on spatial spheres.¹³⁵

Third, it is doubtful that one can find in I.3.16b a direct borrowing from the biblical figure of Wisdom. Although 'flesh' and 'spirit' may have taken on more definite spatial connotations in the Wisdom literature, there is no reference

134. So R.B.Y. Scott, "The Study of the Wisdom Literature", pp. 23f. Supra, pp. 243f.

135. This is not to suggest that Hebraic thought was not aware of a spatial distinction between earth and heaven (e.g. God comes down to view the Tower of Babel and descends upon Mount Sinai), but only that the development of these concepts within Judaism were primarily the result of increased contact with Hellenism.

therein to the figure of Wisdom appearing ἐν σαρκί. Nor is there any reference to her vindication by God during her ascent, nor to her triumph over the 'spirit-powers', nor to her exaltation and ultimate elevation ἐν δόξῃ. Instead, her return (I Enoch 42.1f.) is anything but glorious, since she is rejected by a world which chooses to follow 'Unrighteousness'; and she re-ascends no higher than the angels. Moreover, the movement of the figure of Wisdom in Sir. 24.2ff. is downward, emphasizing the idea that Wisdom (the Torah) comes from God. This same direction of movement is emphasized in I Enoch 42.1f., where, however, Wisdom is rejected and has to return. In contrast, the movement of Christ in I.3.16b is essentially upward. It is true that pre-existence is implied in line i. But there is no extensive preoccupation such as we find in the Wisdom literature on the presence and participation of the figure of Wisdom in the creation of the world and on her being sent from God to mankind. For these reasons, one must conclude that the figure of Wisdom and the description of Christ in I.3.16b are simply not all that much alike.

Nevertheless, Stenger's analysis serves to illustrate how much the ideas of the surrounding cultures had influenced Judaism by the first century A.D. The use of spatial categories to distinguish between the human and the divine, and the use of the figure of Wisdom akin in many ways to foreign cults were not unknown to the Palestinian Jew in the Christian era; nor were they irrelevant. For they, too, were concerned with the gap which separates man from God, and many would have found in Christ the 'Mediator' figure through whom reunion is

effected. Thus, it is entirely possible that I.3.16b spatial contrast included, could have been written by a Palestinian-Jewish Christian. But these patterns appear to be native not to the Jewish but to the surrounding cultures. It has already been observed that their introduction in Jewish literature should be largely attributed to extraneous influence; and, in particular, spatial patterns of thought, in contrast to the temporal, were at home in the Hellenistic world. Hence, it may be supposed that the gospel of I.3.16b was especially relevant to the Hellenistic-Gentile Christians, and that this may be a further indication that I.3.16b was written with them in view.

6. R.H. Gundry - Palestinian-Judaic & 'descensus ad inferos':

In the prior sections of this historical analysis (and the previous analyses as well), it was sometimes suggested that certain Judaic concepts may have influenced the development of I.3.16b. It is to the credit of R.H. Gundry that these questions have been brought to the fore. But before we become involved in a detailed discussion of this possibility, an analysis of his view that I.3.16b is patterned after the 'descensus Christi ad inferos' of I Peter 3.18ff. is in order.

a) Descensus Christi ad inferos:

In contrast to all the schemes considered above in which the pattern is essentially 'upward' throughout the form ($\setminus_1 \longrightarrow^{vi}$), Gundry regards lines ii and iii as referring to the descent of Christ into Hell ($i \setminus_{ii-iii} \swarrow_{iv-v}^{vi}$) as in I

Peter 3.18ff. In the latter passage he finds that the 'vivified' Christ in 'spirit-form' between his death and resurrection goes down to the underworld to proclaim his triumph to the hostile spirits there:¹³⁶

"I Peter then means that upon his expiration Jesus came alive again in spirit through renewed fellowship with the Father..., went to the abyss in spirit-form to proclaim his triumph, and thus enjoyed vindication before the hostile spirits there. By the same token, line 2 in I Timothy 3:16 most likely refers to that vindication in spirit prior to the resurrection.....if line 2 refers to vindication through descent into hades..., 'seen by angels' in line 3 refers to the sight of the vivified Christ in spirit-form by the 'spirits in prison'..."

This pattern of the 'descensus Christi ad inferos' Gundry accepts as Jewish, the concepts of the descent and underworld being 'native' to first century Palestine.

The similarity of style and thought between I.3.16b and I Peter 3.18ff. has been recognized by recent scholars. E.G. Selwyn sets the two passages side by side:¹³⁷

<u>I.3.16b</u>	<u>I Peter 3.18ff.</u>
<u>ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί</u>	v.18 - <u>θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκί</u> (4.6 - <u>ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπου σαρκί</u>)
<u>ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι</u>	18 - <u>ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι</u> (4.6 - <u>ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ θεὸν πνεύματι</u>)
<u>ἦφθη ἀγγέλοις</u>	19 - <u>τοῖς ἐκ φυλακῆς πνεύμασι</u> <u>πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν</u> 22 - <u>ὑποταχέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ</u> <u>ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων</u>
<u>ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν</u>	21 - <u>ὑμᾶς νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα...</u>
<u>ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ</u>	<u>συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα</u> <u>εἰς θεόν</u>
<u>ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ</u>	22 - <u>ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ,</u> <u>πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν</u>

136. Op. Cit., pp. 213ff. H.J. Holtzmann (Die Pastoralbriefe, Leipzig, 1880, p. 333f.) had previously viewed I.3.16b as patterned after the 'Höllenfahrt' of I Pet. 3.18ff. (supra, p.42).

137. The First Epistle of St. Peter, London, 1949, p. 325.

Selwyn concludes that "the first, second, and sixth articles of this statement of faith are so nearly paralleled in I Pet. iii. 18-22 as to point to dependence".¹³⁸ M.É. Boismard comes to a similar conclusion,¹³⁹ and W.J. Dalton who has written a dissertation on I Peter 3.18 finds the similarities 'striking'.¹⁴⁰

The resemblances between these two passages cannot be denied. But it is questionable whether I.3.16b was patterned after the 'descensus ad inferos' of I Pet. 3.18ff. First, it may be observed that there is no positive evidence that I.3.16b refers to a journey into the underworld. There is no hint of a 'descensus ad inferos' within I.3.16b, and to suggest its presence from a comparison with I. Pet. 3.18ff. is problematical as will be seen below.

Second, Gundry's interpretation and comparison of lines ii and iii of I.3.16b with I Peter 3.18e, 19 - ζωοποιήθεῖς δὲ ἐν πνεύματι : ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν πορεύεσθαι ἐκήρυξεν - may be questioned. He interprets I Pet. 3.18e in terms of Christ's vivification rather than his resurrection. ἐν ᾧ therefore, refers to the 'spirit' of Christ which, in its 'vivified' (not yet resurrected) state, went and preached to the spirits in prison. It is this pattern of thought which Gundry finds in lines ii and iii respectively: his 'vindication in spirit prior to the resurrection'; and his appearance before the 'spirits in prison'. But, a) it is doubtful

138. Ibid.

139. Quatre hymnes baptismales, Paris, 1961, pp. 57ff.

140. Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits, Rome, 1965, pp. 100f.

that Gundry's interpretation of I. Pet. 3.18e, 19 can be maintained. Most scholars find in v. 18e a reference to Christ's resurrection; and they are widely divided as to the antecedent of ἐν ᾧ.¹⁴¹ b) The difficulty of viewing ἐν πνεύματι in line ii as the vivified 'individual human spirit of Christ' has been noted above.¹⁴² It may also be suggested that the note of triumph over the 'spirits in prison' would go beyond the normal Hebraic sense of δικαίω, 'to put a person in the right', 'to redress'. Moreover, in this interpretation, line iii appears redundant; and it is questionable whether ἄγγέλους should be limited to the 'spirits in prison'.¹⁴³ c) Although a comparison of the two passages may be justified due to their similarities, their supposed parallelism is not perfect. In I.3.16b, lines i and ii do not refer specifically to the events of death and resurrection as in v. 18de. Line iv speaks of a proclamation ἐν ἑθνεσιν, not to the 'spirits in prison'.¹⁴⁴ In fact, unless Selwyn's parallel has some validity at this point (which is doubtful),

141. Note the discussion by W.J. Dalton, Ibid, pp. 137ff.

142. Supra, pp. 128f.

143. Supra, p. 160. Gundry (Op. Cit., pp. 215f.) appears to contradict himself in this regard later in his essay: "the antithesis ἄγγέλους/ἑθνεσιν appears not to contrast Jews and Gentiles or angels and Gentiles, but superhuman and human beings. 'Nations' therefore is to be preferred". This statement implies that ἄγγέλους should refer not just to the 'spirits in prison', but also to all supernatural beings.

144. O. Cullmann (The Earliest Christian Confessions, p. 60, n. 1) disagrees: "The continuation, 'preached unto the Gentiles', alludes probably to Christ's preaching to the dead". But the 'spirits' of I Pet. 3.19 probably refer to supernatural, not human beings.

there is nothing in vv. 18ff. which is comparable to lines iv and v of I.3.16b. Moreover, if lines ii and iii refer to Christ's descent and line vi to his ascension, why is there no explicit mention of his resurrection as in I Pet.

3.21?¹⁴⁵ These and similar problems of comparison should be kept in mind.

Third, there is some question as to whether I Pet. 3.18ff. actually refers to a 'descensus Christi ad inferos'. F.W. Beare regards the descensus concept as the 'more natural' interpretation.¹⁴⁶ Scholars such as Bo Reicke and E. Best competently defend this view.¹⁴⁷ But J.N.D. Kelly argues convincingly that the location of the 'spirits in prison' is not necessarily under the earth, but above the earth.¹⁴⁸ It may be that we are reading back into the passage later Jewish Christian tradition which, according to J. Daniélou, developed after the New Testament era and was ultimately included in the Church's Creed.¹⁴⁹ Because of the uncertainty of the prison's

145. Gundry (Op. Cit., p. 213) finds the following progression of thought in I Pet. 3.18ff: "'died/put to death' - 'vivified' - 'having gone and preached to the spirits in prison' - 'resurrection of Jesus Christ' - 'at the right hand of God, having gone into heaven'."

146. The First Epistle of Peter, Oxford, 1961, pp. 144f.

147. Reicke, The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism, København, 1946, pp. 115-7; Best, I Peter (NCB), London, 1971, p. 143.

148. The Epistles of Peter and of Jude (BNTC), London, 1969, pp. 155f. Cf. W.J. Dalton, Op. Cit., pp. 177ff. Both scholars list references, mostly in contemporary apocryphal literature, in which the prison of the fallen angels or the abode of evil spirits is located in one of the lower levels of heaven, or 'in the west', etc., and not necessarily 'down' in the nether world.

149. A History of Early Christian Doctrine, I, trans. J.A. Baker, London, 1964, pp. 233ff. Cf. J.N.D. Kelly, Early Christian Creeds, London, 1950, pp. 378ff.; W. Bieder, Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfahrt Jesu Christi, Zürich, 1949, pp. 109ff., esp. p. 128; H. Schlier, Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief, Tübingen, 1930, pp. 3ff.

precise location, it is best to suspend judgment in this regard. This means that any attempt to find in I.3.16b reference to the 'descensus ad inferos' via I Pet. 3.18ff. must also remain in doubt.

For these reasons, it is doubtful that I.3.16b was patterned after the 'descensus Christi ad inferos' of I Pet. 3.18ff. Although such a view is not impossible, it is at best unlikely. Because of the probable antithetical parallelism of the form, it is more likely that line ii reverses both the direction and location of line i, by referring to his vindication in the heavenly sphere.

b) An 'early Palestinian Jewish matrix':

Careful consideration should be given to R.H. Gundry's discussion of the background of I.3.16b for at least two reasons. First, his view differs from all those previously analyzed in this chapter (with the partial exception of Stenger's) by positing an 'early Palestinian Jewish matrix' for the form. Hence, his discussion will serve to balance the consideration of the various alternatives for the background of I.3.16b. Second, his presentation is the most detailed and extensive discussion of the form to date. Not only does he carefully present reasons for his own view, but he also discusses in depth why the other alternatives should not be accepted. Having already considered these alternative possibilities, we are in a better position to evaluate his criticisms of these views together with his suggestion that I.3.16b arose within an early Palestinian-Judaic context. Therefore, the following analysis should serve both to bring some unity to the various questions already raised as to the

background of I.3.16b, and to clarify the present writer's position in this regard.

Gundry's discussion of the form's background is in two parts. In the first part, he argues that I.3.16b is not necessarily governed by Hellenistic concepts, as E. Schweizer supposes:¹⁵⁰

"Schweizer thinks of the Hellenistic wing of the church. His main argument is that the hymnic quotation prominently exhibits a spatial contrast between upper and lower spheres which would arise from and appeal to the Hellenistic mind in contrast to the temporally oriented Jewish mind".

Following this statement, Gundry proceeds to list reasons for rejecting Schweizer's view. It will be beneficial to consider each of his points separately.

First, he notes:¹⁵¹

"Hellenism had invaded Palestine of the New Testament era more pervasively than used to be thought. Semitic literary features and Hellenistic concepts went together. The religious ideas and expressions of first century Palestine were a mixed bag. Therefore, to say 'Hellenistic' or even 'Jewish Hellenistic' is to be ambiguous. The crucial question is: Palestinian, Jewish, and early, or extra-Palestinian, Gentile, and late?"

In the present writer's view, Gundry's first point strikes at the very heart of Schweizer's view. He correctly perceives that it is difficult to make a sharp distinction between the spatially oriented Hellenist and the temporally oriented Jew, for the studies of E.R. Goodenough, S. Lieberman and others have shown that Hellenism had probably influenced Palestine to a large degree by New Testament times.¹⁵² But having said

150. R.H. Gundry, Op. Cit., p. 216. Supra, Sec. B.4.

151. Ibid., p. 217.

152. Supra, Sec. A., esp. 183ff. Of course, the extent to which Palestinian Judaism was indebted to Hellenism will probably always be a matter of conjecture and debate.

this, it seems contradictory to add that the 'crucial question' is, therefore, 'Palestinian, Jewish, and early, or extra-Palestinian, Gentile, and late'. For if the Hellenization of Palestine at an early date is accepted, if expressions of first century Palestine were 'a mixed bag', then the question as to what is early Palestinian and/or late Hellenistic is itself ambiguous.¹⁵³ Hence, it would appear that Gundry has fallen victim to the same criticism which he has levelled at Schweizer. This will become clearer as the present analysis proceeds.

Gundry's second point is: "whatever spatial contrast may be in I Tim. 3:16...is no more than could have come from Palestine at the very beginning of the church".¹⁵⁴ This question was discussed above in relation to the view of W. Stenger.¹⁵⁵ On the one hand, it is evident that spatial concepts were not alien to the Jewish mind in the first century A.D. As Gundry observes:¹⁵⁶

"God comes down to view the Tower of Babel and descends upon Mount Sinai. Enoch and Elisha are taken up at their translations. The Lord's Prayer, which could hardly be more un-'Hellenistic' and Semitic, carries the contrast 'as in heaven, so on earth'...(etc.)"

153. Supra, p. 254. Cf. the important statement by D. Daube (The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1956, p. ix): "It is becoming ever clearer that Palestinian Judaism of the first century was far more varied and flexible than preoccupation with the particular line which ultimately prevailed would lead one to assume...the sharp distinction between a Hellenistic and a Rabbinic Judaism in the New Testament period is being abandoned as it is found that many Hellenistic ideas have crept into, or been consciously taken over by, Rabbinism long before, and that the process, though slowed down, was not halted". Cf. also W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 8.

154. Op. Cit., p. 217.

155. Supra, pp. 245f.

156. Op. Cit., p. 217.

On the other hand, it is interesting that Gundry also notes that the spatial contrast "appears in the Old Testament, grows in the LXX and Jewish apocryphal and pseudepigraphal literature, and receives expression in rabbinical literature".¹⁵⁷ As was pointed out above, the increased use of spatial concepts in Judaism developed simultaneously with Judaism's increased contact with the surrounding world. This would suggest not that the increased use of spatial concepts was an independent development within Judaism, but that it was (at least, in part) influenced through contact with Hellenism.

Third, Gundry finds that "the spatial contrast in the hymnic quotation is not nearly so strong as Schweizer thinks".¹⁵⁸ In general, the present writer would agree with this statement. Indeed, this argument was used above in criticism of the view of E. Schweizer.¹⁵⁹ But it is possible that Gundry carries this argument too far when he states:¹⁶⁰

"Spatial progression receives clear statement only in lines 5 and 6, '...in [the] world, taken up...', so that only by reading the verse backwards could one gain the impression of strong spatial contrasts. In lines 1 - 4 spatial ideas occur only by silent implication, and then with probable reference to the underworld as well as to earth and heaven".

His argument is quite detailed at this point, and it is necessary only to raise some of its more questionable aspects. For instance, in arguing that 'flesh' and 'spirit' in lines i and ii do not primarily contrast the earthly and heavenly spheres,

157. Ibid.; supra, pp. 245f.

158. Ibid.

159. Supra, p. 239.

160. Op. Cit., p. 218.

he makes the following main points. In the Qumran literature and in Paul (Rom. 8), the flesh/spirit antithesis is used without spatial differentiation. Also, in I.3.16b, these words refer primarily "to the specific flesh and spirit of Christ in his physical incarnation and spiritual vivification (or resurrection) respectively". If this vivification refers to the descensus (which is likely), then it has to do with the nether world, a concept "native to first-century Palestinian thinking"; if it refers to the resurrection, then it occurred on earth, not in heaven.¹⁶¹

The brevity of this summary may do injustice to his detailed argumentation; but it includes his main points. Yet these arguments remain, for the present writer, unconvincing. The identity of terminology in the Qumran and Pauline references does not mean much when the contexts within which the terms are used are different. Gundry's supposition that line ii refers to the 'descensus Christi ad inferos' has already been shown to be improbable; and one may question further whether the idea of the 'descensus' in its entirety is really 'native' to Palestinian Judaism.¹⁶² Moreover, his

161. Ibid., pp. 217f.

162. The origin of the 'descensus' pattern lies in doubt. Scholars such as F.W. Beare (The First Epistle of Peter, p. 145) and W.L. Knox (St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, pp. 221ff.) view the concept as derived from oriental mythology. However, the idea of death as the entrance into the realm of Sheol is Jewish, and is a kind of 'descensus ad inferos'. J.M. Robinson ("Descent into Hades", IDB, I, pp. 826ff.) suggests a compromise, that "the broad tradition of mythology provides less the origin and meaning of the NT idea of Christ's descent into Hades than the vehicle of its development and the cause of its degeneration" (p. 826).

interpretation of ἐν πνεύματι as the vivification of Christ's 'spirit' ("in contrast to...the flesh of his human body"¹⁶³) is more reminiscent of the Greek notion of the immortality of the soul than of the Palestinian Judaic concept of the resurrection or life after death. Finally, the 'resurrection' is not the only alternative to the 'descensus' interpretation in line ii. As the linguistic analysis has indicated, ἐδικαιώθη is probably used in the 'perfective' or 'gnomic' sense of the 'vindication' of Christ in which case the general idea of a heavenly or spiritual sphere of existence would be quite at home in its interpretation.¹⁶⁴

For the present writer, it is difficult not to find some spatial connotations present in lines i and ii and throughout the rest of the form. The use of ἐν plus the dative must be carefully considered. The preposition is found in five of the six lines. In line iii, where ἐν is omitted, the object of the verb is for all purposes 'personal' (a direct dative). ἐν ἔθνεσιν (l. iv) also carries a personal nuance. But even in this antithetical parallelism - ἀγγέλους and ἐν ἔθνεσιν - there are definite implications of locality. These implications are confirmed in line vi where ἐν rather than εἰς follows the verb ἐκδημήθη. While there is evidence (l. iii) that the lines are not to be taken in a strictly locative sense, Gundry himself admits elsewhere in his essay that "place, rather than quality, seems to be in view" in line ii, and that all the other ἐν's are locative.¹⁶⁵

163. R.H. Gundry, Op. Cit., p. 213.

164. Supra, p. 122.

165. Op. Cit., pp. 211f., 213. These concessions are quite inconsistent with his present argument.

Fourth, Gundry questions the theory that the theology of I.3.16b is 'Hellenistic'. He writes:¹⁶⁶

"It is also argued for Hellenistic origin that its message announces deliverance from the fatalism which gloomed the Hellenistic world. A Palestinian theology of the cross is entirely missing. In its place is a theology of cosmic triumph over the 'angels', who contrast with the earthly nations and make up the astral powers to whom Christ appeared during his ascent through the lower heavens to God above".

He reasons that a) "the angelology of first-century Palestinian Judaism suffices to handle that category of celestial beings"; that b) this interpretation of 'angels' as powers in the lower heavens is improbable, especially in view of the 'descensus' concept; and that c) the argument from silence is weak, since part of the form may be missing and may have originally included a theology of the cross.¹⁶⁷

Again, his arguments are unconvincing. a) Gundry relies upon Jewish apocryphal and apocalyptic literature, especially I Enoch, for his understanding of Palestinian Judaic angelology. He does not consider the possibility that these sources were themselves influenced by Hellenism. According to G.W. Anderson, Jewish angelology in many respects was not immune to external influences.¹⁶⁸ b) Not only is the presence of the

166. Ibid., pp. 218f.

167. Ibid.

168. A Critical Introduction of the Old Testament, London, 1970, p. 209. According to G. von Rad ("Engel", TDNT, I, pp. 78f.): "A strange phenomenon, for which there is as yet no adequate explanation from the standpoint of the history of religion, is the development of the previously restricted belief in angels after the exile, leading ultimately to a veritable angelology". Many scholars view the development within Jewish literature as influenced by oriental, esp. Iranian, ideas. Cf. G. Kittel, "Engel", TDNT, I, pp. 81ff, esp. p. 86; T.H. Gaster, "Angel", IDB, I, pp. 132f.

Moreover, it should be remembered that, as Judaism developed in the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D., it became centred more and more around the law, and not around the cosmological speculation then current in Hellenism.

'descensus' idea improbable, but also various indications presented in the analysis of language above (Chap. II) suggest that line iii probably does refer to the exalted Christ's appearance to the 'spirit-powers' in the lower heavens.¹⁶⁹

c) Although dogmatic conclusions should not be based on arguments from silence, it may be suggested that the silence in this case is to some extent 'audible'. For the words appear to have been carefully chosen to convey in general terms the life of Jesus and to avoid specific reference to his atoning death; and the possible combination of the 'constative' and 'perfective' senses of the aorist (ἐφανερώθη) would support this view.¹⁷⁰ Moreover, as was indicated above, there is good reason to suppose that I.3.16b is not a fragment of a larger, original pericope.¹⁷¹

Fifth, Gundry questions the theory of R.H. Fuller that line i "exhibits a Christology of epiphany based on the Hellenistic concept of a θεῖος ἀνὴρ". He shows that the use of φανερώω is not distinctively Hellenistic. Indeed, the idea of God revealing Himself to mankind is part of the Jewish heritage.¹⁷² However, against Gundry's point here, it is questionable whether an epiphany "ἐν σαρκί" was ever a part of this Jewish heritage. In fact, there is reason to suppose that this idea was a stumbling-block for the Jews and

169. Supra, pp. 156ff.

170. Supra, pp. 103ff.; infra, pp. 174ff.

171. Supra, pp. 20ff.

172. Op. Cit., p. 220. Cf. supra, Chap. II, Sec. B.3.

may in part have led to Jesus' crucifixion.¹⁷³ Furthermore, one must take into account the cogent argument of A. Oepke that the use of φανερώ (in contrast to ἀποκαλύπτω) in the New Testament "is partly due to the missionary encounter".¹⁷⁴

This concludes the analysis of the first part of Gundry's discussion in which he argues against E. Schweizer's view that I.3.16b is governed by Hellenistic concepts. On the one hand, his discussion serves as a reminder that certain concepts labelled 'Hellenistic' by many recent scholars - spatial categories, astral powers, cosmic speculation, etc. - were shared in part by Palestinian Jews in the first century A.D. Thus it is not inconceivable that I.3.16b could have been written even in Jerusalem. On the other hand, the present writer remains unconvinced by Gundry's argument that one is not bound to see Hellenistic features in I.3.16b. For the concepts which are found in the Jewish literature of that day are not necessarily 'native' to Judaism, if by Judaism we are thinking of its racial-geographical boundary in Palestine and/or its lineal relation to Hebraism proper. For a concept to be 'native' to Judaism, it would have to be "inborn; innate; not acquired".¹⁷⁵ But it is quite probable that certain ideas in I.3.16b do not fit into this category.

R.H. Gundry begins the second part of his discussion thus:¹⁷⁶

"It is not only that we are not bound to see necessarily Hellenistic features in I Timothy 3:16; a number of features positively favour an early Palestinian Jewish matrix rather than a 'Hellenistic' one".

173. Supra, pp. 230f.

174. "ἀποκαλύπτω", TDNT, III, pp. 590f.; cf. also R. Bultmann and D. Lührmann, "φανερώ", TWNT, 9/1, pp. 4ff.

175. Webster's New World Dictionary, Cleveland/New York, 1959, p. 977.

176. Op. Cit., p. 220.

His first observation is an important one. He refers to E. Norden's examination of the Jewish character of its form: the "hebräischen Gedankenparallelismus" over against the "hellenischen Satzparallelismus",¹⁷⁷ the word order in which the verbs come first, and "the characteristically Semitic passive form of the verbs in all six lines", as in the Lord's Prayer.¹⁷⁸

Then, Gundry lists what he considers to be "additional evidences for a Semitic matrix":¹⁷⁹

"1) the similarity of the implied pre-existence of Christ in line 1 to Jewish ideas concerning the pre-existence of the Torah, the tabernacle, the Messiah, and so on, 2) the similarity of Christ's manifestation in line 1 to Old Testament theophanies, 3) the Semitic flavour of ἐδικαιώθη in the sense of vindication, 4) the use of ἵσταται (line 3) in a way reminiscent of its frequent use in the LXX for nir'ah concerning divine appearances, 5) the correspondence of the simple dative (rather than ἵμῳ with the genitive) to 'el in the Old Testament texts, 6) the similarity of lines 2 and 3 (if they refer to the Descensus) to the Enochian world of thought, and 7) the similarity of line 6 to the ascensions of Enoch and Elijah and to the concept of the shekinah glory".

For the present writer, points 3), 4) and 5) may be accepted without further comment.¹⁸⁰ The remaining points, however, require some attention. Whether the idea of pre-existence' (point 1) is 'native' to Judaism and not just present is an important question. In the analysis above, it was concluded that the concept was largely dependent upon extraneous influences.¹⁸¹ This means that the concept of 'pre-existence'

177. Agnostos Theos, Darmstadt, 1971, pp. 256f. Supra, pp. 46f.

178. Gundry, Op. Cit., p. 220.

179. Ibid., pp. 220f.

180. Concerning points 3) and 4), supra, pp. 113ff. and 145. Concerning point 5), cf. J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, London, 1966, p. 103.

181. Supra, p. 228.

does not necessarily favor an 'early Palestinian Jewish matrix' as Gundry suggests. Gundry's second point may also be questioned in this regard because of the added phrase in line 1, ἐν σαρκί. As J. Barr notes, words receive their significance within a context, especially the sentence.¹⁸² The problems with point 6) have already been discussed in depth in this section. Not only is the influence of the 'descensus' concept on I.3.16b improbable, but also both the 'Enochian world of thought' and the 'descensus' pattern appear to have been influenced in part by Hellenism. Gundry's last point (7) may be questioned as well. The preposition εἰς, not ἐν, is used with reference to the ascensions of Enoch and Elijah;¹⁸³ and it is doubtful that Gundry's interpretation of ἐν δόξῃ as the shekinah cloud of Acts 1.11 should be accepted.¹⁸⁴

Therefore, not all the features listed by Gundry necessarily reflect 'an early Palestinian Jewish matrix'. In fact, some would suggest Hellenistic influence, e.g. the concepts of 'pre-existence' and manifestation 'in flesh'. But certain of his points concerning the Jewish character of I.3.16b may be accepted - the Semitic character of its form and the use of ἐδιναιώθη and ὑφ' ὅν. To these might be added the points of the linguistic analysis above: that the contrast of σάρξ and πνεῦμα appears to be more Hebraic than Hellenistic;¹⁸⁵

182. Supra, pp. 80f.

183. I Enoch 71.1; 4 Kings 2.11.

184. Supra, pp. 166f.

185. Supra, p. 139.

that ἐν ἑθνεσιν is probably to be taken in its narrower Judaic technical sense of 'heathen' or 'pagans';¹⁸⁶ and that ἐν δόξῃ is used in a sense for which there is no Greek analogy to denote the presence of God.¹⁸⁷ There is also the suggestion of E. Schweizer that the chiasmic pattern reflects Hebraic influence.¹⁸⁸

In conclusion, R.H. Gundry fails to convince the present writer that I.3.16b is derived simply from 'an early Palestinian Jewish matrix'. Certain concepts are present in the form which are difficult to explain apart from Hellenistic influence: 'pre-existence', manifestation 'in flesh', the extensive use of spatial categories, the 'theology of cosmic triumph', as well as the probable reference to 'spirit-powers' in line iii. These concepts cannot be dismissed simply by referring to their presence in Palestine in the first century A.D. One must also ask whether they were 'native' to Palestine. Nevertheless, Gundry's analysis does serve to indicate that certain Jewish characteristics are present in I.3.16b, and their presence cannot be ignored.

C. Conclusion.

Several points stand out as significant with regard to the historical background of I.3.16b. First, there is the inability of scholars to attach these six lines to any specific scheme of the first century A.D. Though the various

186. Supra, pp. 153ff.

187. Supra, pp. 163f.

188. Neotestamentica, pp. 125f.; p. 126, n. 7. Cf. N.W. Lund, Chiasmus in the New Testament, Chapel Hill, 1942, pp. 128-136, 230-233. Supra, p. 237.

schemes analyzed above resemble the form to some extent, their parallelism is not complete, and there appear to be as many exceptions to the rule as similarities.¹⁸⁹ Therefore, no pattern was found that could be accepted as having definitely influenced the author's order of lines or choice of content. Indeed, the utmost that can be claimed in this regard is that there was a basic pattern well understood in the contemporary world which lent itself to the progression and significance of the lines. Vital differences rule out any further direct borrowing.

Nevertheless, care must be taken to distinguish between the improbable influence of any one pattern on the author, and the possible later influence of such patterns on the various members of the Christian community who recited the form. Those Christians familiar with the concepts of the Gnostic Redeemer, the figure of Wisdom, the 'divine man', etc., may have interpreted I.3.16b in the light of their respective backgrounds. But it would appear to the present writer that, whatever strands of Christian speculation may have influenced its later interpreters, most Christians in the first century would have viewed I.3.16b primarily not via some secondary pattern then popular in their world of thought, but via their understanding of the earthly and post-resurrection life of Jesus apart from such extraneous forms. This would be supported by the fact that none of the various

189. This conclusion serves to support S. Neill's warning quoted above that "whatever form of classification we adopt, we are likely to find that the exceptions are as numerous as the items which fit into our scheme"; supra, p. 181.

patterns examined above were able to account fully for the form's sequence and content.

Second, it has become increasingly evident that most of the features of I.3.16b were held in common throughout the Near East. Hence, it has been virtually impossible to classify the passage as either Hebraic or Hellenistic, to think of it in terms of early-Palestinian or late-Hellenistic, or to make geographical distinctions. This serves to underline the recent consensus of opinion that Hellenism had invaded Palestine to some considerable extent by the first century A.D.

However, certain features are present in I.3.16b which may be regarded as more 'Judaic' than 'Hellenistic', and vice versa. On the one hand, there are those Hebraic (hence, 'Judaic') verbal and formal characteristics which betray the author's background in this tradition.¹⁹⁰ On the other hand, the subject matter of the passage would appear to have been written with an Hellenistic audience in view. Absent is the explicit mention of the atoning death and resurrection of Christ and of the forgiveness of sins. The emphasis is quite different from that found in the Jerusalem kerygma.¹⁹¹ Instead, the passage speaks of the divine dimension of Jesus' manifestation in flesh and his subsequent vindication and exaltation over the powers in heaven and the multitudes of unbelieving men on earth. Christ's universal Lordship over both spheres of existence appears to be the primary emphasis and concern of the passage.¹⁹² In this regard, it is

190. These 'Judaic' features have been listed above, supra, pp. 263f.

191. Infra, pp. 280ff.

192. Cf. the excellent synopsis in this regard by H. Swanston, The Community Witness, London, 1967, pp. 192ff.

significant to note how similar the results of this analysis are to those of R.P. Martin concerning Phil. 2.6-11. He concludes:¹⁹³

"Clearly, the author of Philippians ii.6-11 stands at the junction of two cultures and two religious traditions. His background is Jewish, but it is Greek ideas which stand at the forefront of his mind; and he is concerned, as a Christian, to relate the Gospel to the larger world of Hellenism".

Although there is not as much evidence in I.3.16b to state categorically that such is the case, it would appear reasonable to suppose that the same conclusion should be made concerning the author and background of our text.¹⁹⁴

Finally, it is hoped that the results reached in this analysis are consistent with the probable interpretation of the subject matter of the text and not too much conditioned by the presuppositions that have inevitably played a role in the present writer's assessment of the evidence. Therefore, the results of this analysis must be accepted with discretion. It is probable that many factors influenced the author's thinking, and we do not claim to have exhausted the various possibilities.

193. R.P. Martin, Carmen Christi, p. 297.

194. One must be careful not to carry this argument too far. In the Magnificat (Lk. 1.51ff.), we find a piece of poetic prose inserted by the author and dependent upon certain Old Testament passages. Though these verses may be a part of an earlier tradition being used by Luke, it may be observed that Luke was himself a Gentile Christian.

CONCLUSION

In the past, interpretations of I.3.16b have varied widely with reference to its form, language and historical background. The purpose of this thesis was to endeavor to bring some order to this present state of confusion. Having therefore completed a thorough examination of the passage, one must consider to what extent this objective has been reached.

Procedure

First, there was the procedural problem. Where should the thesis commence? Justification was given for the present order of the chapters and their subdivisions.¹ What effect did this procedure have on the results of the thesis, and were these effects favorable?

In the present writer's mind, the effects were on the whole favorable. It is his conviction that by commencing with the analysis of form which included an extensive historical survey of the interpretation of I.3.16b, presuppositions were held to a minimum and the thesis progressed from the simple to the more difficult, from areas of more agreement to less agreement. This has been verified by the conclusions of each chapter. Furthermore, the conclusion of the analysis of form had a very decisive effect on the later analyses, as the following paragraphs will demonstrate.

Form

In the analysis of form, it was established that I.3.16b was an inserted traditional pericope which could have been

1. Supra, pp. 6ff.

used originally either as a confession or as a hymn. Perhaps it was a combination of the two, a hymn enumerating the various facts of salvation, a 'Bekenntnislid'. But the conclusion which had the greatest effect on the interpretation of the passage was that I.3.16b is structured according to a 3x2 arrangement, which further exhibits a chiasmic antithetical parallelism contrasting in general two spheres of existence. This is in accord with the modern consensus of opinion, and various reasons were given for its acceptance.²

Language

This conclusion of the analysis of form was utilized in the ensuing analysis of language as a guideline for the interpretation of the lines. The lines were viewed as couplets rather than as individual units, thereby enlarging the immediate context of the words and phrases. Some might object that by following this method, the interpretation rests to too great an extent on the 3x2 arrangement of the passage which is not a foregone conclusion. But the present writer preferred taking this risk rather than approach the interpretation of the lines with no guideline at all. Furthermore, the presence of spatial nuances in each line received support from the linguistic analysis, though these spatial categories appear to be tempered by personal nuances as well.

Of particular note in the analysis of language is the use of the aorist tense. Though the subject of the six aorist verbs is Christ, the lines do not appear to be referring to

2. Supra, pp. 56ff.

specific events in his life. Instead, they seem to be used in a timeless, almost axiomatic way, suggesting that the verbs should be viewed as 'complexive' (constative) and/or 'perfective' and/or 'gnomic' aorists.³ In this way, the emphasis in each line is on the 'consequence', i.e. the soteriological significance, of the earthly and post-resurrection life of Christ. Hence, the following progression of pairs:

lines i & ii - that he was 'revealed' in both realms⁴
 lines iii & iv - that he was 'presented' in both realms
 lines v & vi - that he was 'received' in both realms

In summary, the conclusion of the analysis of language would suggest that the six lines could be paraphrased as follows:⁵

(concerning Jesus Christ, who)
 was the revelation of the divine in the realm of flesh,
 was subsequently vindicated by God in the realm of spirit,
 was presented (appeared) to the 'spirit-powers',
 was presented (proclaimed) to the unbelieving nations,
 was received by all mankind in faith,
 was received by all supernatural beings in submission
 and worship.

Historical background

Using the results of the analyses of form and language, an examination of the text's historical background was pursued. The conclusions were mostly negative in character - i.e. that I.3.16b was not patterned after any of the several suggested

3. Supra, pp. 172.

4. Christ's 'vindication' (l. ii) subsequent to his revelation in the flesh and death may be considered in a very real sense a 'revelation' in the realm of spirit. Supra, p. 122.

5. Supra, pp. 171f.; infra, Excursus II.

schemes of its contemporary environment, and that it could not be categorized as either 'Judaic' or 'Hellenistic'. Nevertheless, there were also the positive, if not decisive, results of the analysis. For the author appears to be debtor to both the Hebraic and Hellenistic thought-worlds. Features generally accepted as being characteristic of both environments are present in this small form of six succinct lines. This serves to underline recent opinion that the first century A.D. was characterized by religious syncretism. In fact, I.3.16b stands as an excellent example of this syncretistic spirit in process. For, due to the presence on the one hand of the finer points of Hebraic form and verbal expressions and on the other hand of the general Hellenistic theme of the passage - the Lordship of Christ over both realms of existence, it would appear that the author may have had a Judaic background but was concerned in this brief form to relate the Gospel to the larger world of Hellenism.⁶

Sitz im Leben

The analysis of historical background did not suggest a more precise Sitz im Leben for I.3.16b. R. Deichgräber thinks that it is impossible to determine the more specific life-situation which encouraged this form to develop.⁷ Surely, whatever suggestion is accepted by the interpreter, it must be viewed as hypothetical and largely dependent upon the student's personal preference. For this reason, a thorough

6. Supra, pp. 266f.

7. Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus, Göttingen, 1967, p. 137.

discussion was not included in the body of the thesis. But now that the main analyses are complete, it will be beneficial to review the alternative possibilities.

Most probable was its origin in the worship of the early Church. According to O. Cullmann:⁸

"In general the liturgy in the first congregations is something extraordinarily alive, and liturgical formulae show no sign of being paralysed".

In favor of this view is the form's poetic style and note of praise. In any case, it may be accepted that if the passage was not originally created with the liturgy of the Church in view, then it was quickly adopted and used by the Church in their liturgy.⁹

Some scholars have suggested an even more precise location for the origin of I.3.16b. H. Lietzmann supposes that it was originally part of a thanksgiving prayer said at the Eucharist.¹⁰

8. Early Christian Worship, trans. A. Todd and J. Torrance, London, 1953, p. 25.

9. As a primitive Christian hymn or confession, or more preferably a 'Bekenntnislid', the purpose of composing this form for the liturgy would have been to express for the new converts their new found faith. Christ, the manifestation of the divine in flesh, is now exalted and Lord over all living creatures in heaven and earth. This message would elicit thanksgiving and joy in this occasion.

Note the view of W. Stenger ("Der Christushymnus", Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift, 78 [1969] pp. 46ff.), that the hymn originated as a confession praising the exalted Lord in the liturgy of the early Church. But then it was used further as a confession of faith within the churches of the Pastoral Epistles, and finally as a decisive argument against the false teachers in the context of I Timothy.

10. Mass and Lord's Supper, Fascicle 3, trans. D.H.G. Reeve, Leiden, 1954, pp. 145f. Lietzmann writes (p. 146): "... anyone who wishes to have a vivid picture of Paul conducting a celebration of the Supper may well put on his lips a eucharistic prayer which, in form and content, is similar to the above quoted examples" (Phil. 2.5-11; I.3.16b; I Pet. 3.18-22). R.P. Martin rightly comments
[Contd.]

Others have suggested that the hymn was formed in a baptismal context.¹¹ But H. Zimmermann is no doubt correct in stating:¹²

"Sein 'Ort' ist selbstverständlich der christliche Gottesdienst. Genauere Angaben, ob es sich etwa um einen Taufhymnus handelt, oder ob das Lied in der Eucharistiefeier seinen Platz hatte, lassen sich dagegen nicht machen".

Other factors may also account for the presence of certain themes in the passage. Apologetic or polemic purposes may have led to the stress on the incarnation in line i to counteract gnostic docetism and asceticism.¹³ Moreover, the emphasis on the universalism of the Gospel may have been meant to counteract gnostic and/or Judaic esotericism. A more important factor might have been the setting of persecution which would account for the emphasis of the Lordship of Christ over the powers who are in control both in the natural and supernatural realms of existence. Christ, being the Victor over these threatening forces, stands as a sign of hope and salvation in this case.¹⁴

Contd.] ("Aspects of Worship", Vox Evangelica, II, London, 1963, p. 32, n. 102) that "Leitzmann's theory...is stated only tentatively and with little supporting evidence". G. Holtz (Die Pastoralbriefe, Berlin, 1965, p. 93) also shares Leitzmann's point of view.

11. Numerous scholars share this view. Cf. M.-É. Boismard, Quatre hymnes baptismales, Paris, 1961, p. 10 (note pp. 9-14); E.G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, London, 1947, p. 326; J. Schmitt, Jésus ressuscité dans la prédication apostolique, Paris, 1949, p. 100; D.M. Stanley, Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology, Rome, 1961, pp. 236ff.; H.F.G. Swanston, The Community Witness, London, 1968, pp. 188ff., esp. pp. 192ff.; R.P. Martin, Op. Cit., p. 26. The last two works listed are perhaps the most helpful in clarifying this view.
12. Neutestamentlich Methodenlehre, Stuttgart, 1968², p. 213.
13. This would be supported from the context of I Timothy in which the passage is used for similar apologetic and polemic concerns.
14. H.A. Blair (A Creed Before the Creeds, London, 1955, p. 79) views I.3.16b as an expansion of the primitive 'homologia', "Jesus Christ is Lord". According to V.H. Neufeld (The
[Contd.]

Order of the lines

C.F.D. Moule writes that it is "notoriously difficult to squeeze these six lines at all convincingly into conformity with any logical pattern".¹⁵ The rationale of their sequence has always been somewhat of an enigma for most scholars. Have the above analyses contributed any further light on the order of the lines?

In the analysis of historical background, six different schemata were examined which might have proved helpful in this regard. But vital differences between these patterns and I.3.16b ruled out direct borrowing. The most that could be supposed is 'that there was a basic pattern well understood in the contemporary world which lent itself to the progression and significance of the lines'.¹⁶ But this is not an adequate explanation.

Contd.] Earliest Christian Confessions, Leiden, 1963, pp. 19f.), "the setting for denial as well as for confession is frequently the persecution of Christians or their defense of the Christian faith". O.R.B. Wilson ("A Study of the Early Christian Creedal Hymn of I Timothy 3:16", unpublished doctoral thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, 1954, pp. 38ff.) argues, therefore, that ὁμολογουμένως in the introductory statement reflects persecution since confession of Jesus as Lord occasioned it. But this does not take into account two factors: a) that the term ὁμολογουμένως is not part of the original Sitz im Leben; and b) that ὁμολογουμένως is used in I.3.16a not with reference to persecution but for other concerns (*infra*, pp. 286ff.). Moreover, it is questionable whether the adverb even contains reference to the 'homologia'.

For a more recent and coherent defense of this position, cf. R.H. Gundry, "The Form, Meaning and Background of the Hymn Quoted in I Timothy 3:16", Apostolic History and the Gospel, edd. W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin, Grand Rapids, 1970, pp. 221f.

15. The Birth of the New Testament (BNTC), London, 1966, p. 24.

16. Supra, pp. 264f.

There is also the suggestion that the six lines refer to specific events in the life of Christ and do so with a chronological framework in mind. But this recommendation also has its difficulties. For lines iv and v appear to represent not just one point of time in history, but an extension of time from the beginning of the proclamation to that day of universal belief. Also, the remaining four lines evade every attempt to attach them to specific events in Christ's life, whether his birth, life, death, descent into hell, resurrection and appearances, ascension or parousia.

What, then, is the explanation for their sequence? It would now appear that there was a combination of factors involved. First, there is the general theme of the exaltation of Christ. For the form progresses from his manifestation in flesh to his final reception in glory.

Second, there is the progression of the lines in pairs from revelation to presentation to reception. Hence, we are concerned not with six separate lines, but with the succession of three pairs, each contrasting two realms of existence. For whereas 'flesh', 'nations' and 'world' relate to this sphere of existence, 'spirit', 'angels' and 'glory' refer to another (supernatural) sphere of existence.

Third, there is the role of the aorist tense in the form. Unlike those forms which enumerate events in the life of Jesus (I Cor. 15.3ff.; Rom. 1.3f.; 4.24f.; 8.34 and I Pet. 3.18ff.), I.3.16b refers to the 'consequence' of such events; for the verbs should be viewed as 'complexive' (constative) and/or 'perfective' and/or 'gnomic' aorist. Hence, the lines point to the soteriological implications of Christ's

earthly and post-resurrection life.

Together, these three considerations present us with a logical progression of thought based on soteriological considerations. The six lines relate to the redemptive effect Christ's person and work had in both spheres of existence. On earth, his appearance is followed by his proclamation (presentation) and reception by all mankind. In heaven, his vindication is followed by his confrontation (presentation) with the 'spirit-powers' and his ultimate exaltation as κύριος τῆς δόξης.

Nevertheless, there is one further factor which appears to have contributed to the order of the lines. For the passage does not present itself simply as a systematic presentation of the soteriological significance of the life of Christ. One must take into account the element of faith which is expressed in the use of the aorist tense. It may be that, viewed from the present perspective, the lines are to be viewed as conveying the timeless truths that the divine has been revealed in the flesh, but that his death did not nullify this revelation. His subsequent vindication in his resurrected state, his presentation and reception in both realms of existence are now self-evident facts to be believed.

But, it may also be that the passage is to be viewed from an eschatologically present context in which we are present with Christ ἐν δόξῃ. From this perspective, each of the six indicated actions may be viewed as a completed whole (complexive aorists), regardless of the time-element involved. Ἐφανερώθη would indicate the entire incarnation as an event in

past time. Ἐδικαίωθη could refer to his subsequent vindication in that he is henceforth the resurrected/exalted One. The remaining four lines may then refer to that extension of time during which Christ subjects all things unto himself (I Cor. 15. 24ff.) and does so as the One received in glory.

From either perspective, it is not difficult to determine 'why' the aorist tense was used consistently throughout the form. It was used to confess that the Church not only lives in the present with the realization that Christ is Lord of our lives and has control of our destiny, but also lives in anticipation of the future so that its hope of his ultimate triumph over all things can be confidently expressed even in terms of the aorist tense.

Author

In the analysis of historical background, it was suggested that the background of the author may have been Jewish, due to the presence in the passage of Hebraic formal and verbal characteristics. However, he was concerned to communicate the Gospel to the world of Hellenism. This would account for the emphasis on mission in lines iv and v, and for the essentially Greek 'theology of cosmic triumph'. These conclusions have led R.P. Martin to suggest that I.3.16b is the product of "some Hellenistic Jewish-Christian community, of which the school of Stephen is the most illustrious example".¹⁷ R.H. Gundry reaches a similar conclusion, suggesting also that the possible Sitz im Leben of persecution points in this direction.¹⁸ There is nothing in this thesis to discount this

17. "Aspects of Worship", p. 26.

18. Op. Cit., p. 221.

possibility, though it must be pointed out that such characteristics were not limited to the Stephen school in Antioch. Of course, any attempt to attach the authorship to either Paul or John or Luke is extremely hypothetical. It is perhaps best to suspend judgment for the present with regard to a more specific assignment of authorship.

Date

Many scholars, without further reflection, suppose that I.3.16b is a very early traditional form. But in view of the above conclusions, it would be wise not to put too early a date on its composition. There are the following considerations:

- 1) its symmetrical form;
- 2) the absence of specific events such as are found in the Jerusalem kerygma and in I Cor. 15.3ff.;
- 3) the presence of a 'theology of cosmic triumph' which would compare favorably to themes which are prominent in the later letters of the New Testament canon;¹⁹
- 4) the inclusion of ἐν σαρκε as part of the confession;²⁰
- 5) the inclusion of the 'mission motif' in lines iv and v.²¹

The cumulative effect suggests a somewhat later date than has often been supposed. But, on the other hand, it did not take long for the Early Church to become aware of its mission to

19. Supra, 231f.

20. Supra, 106.

21. W. Stenger (Op. Cit., pp. 41f.) thinks that the reference to mission necessarily requires a late date, since the idea of the universality of God's kingdom was already present in the OT. Note also the article by M. Hengel ("Die Ursprünge der christlichen Mission", NTS, 18 [1971] pp. 15ff.) in which he concludes that even the earliest Palestinian community was missionary oriented. In brief, the history and theology of primitive Christianity are missionary history and missionary theology.

the wider world of Hellenism, and there is good reason to suppose that hymns and confessions were present from the very beginning of Christendom. Therefore, it could have been composed at any time between the beginning of the expansion of Christianity into the Hellenistic world and the writing of I Timothy. For the present writer, a later date rather than an earlier one is to be preferred.

Additional problems for discussion

In the course of my work, it has become apparent to me that the following questions relating generally to the subject of the thesis would merit further investigation and study. First, Form-criticism is unable to ascertain positively in many cases whether a given liturgical piece or fragment was employed as a hymn, a prayer, a confession, or for some other purpose in the service of worship (or was it even liturgical?). I.3.16b is an excellent example in this regard. Recent discussions have a tendency to assume that the passage was an early Christian hymn, perhaps composed within the context of baptism. But, as has already been observed, this was not necessarily the case.²² The confessional features of the form, the various alternatives as to its Sitz im Leben, etc., suggest that it is wise to be flexible in this regard. Unfortunately, recent studies attempting to distinguish between the various forms of tradition found in the New Testament are often too general in scope and circular in reasoning; i.e. they use the features of I.3.16b to detect other hymnic

22. Supra, pp. 22ff.

material, assuming that I.3.16b is hymnic.

This suggests a second area for further investigation. Most studies of traditional material in the New Testament are brief and general, and have not given sufficient attention to the specific texts they are attempting to clarify. Furthermore, the texts selected by most scholars are generally the same - Rom. 1.3-4; Phil. 2.6-11; Col. 1.15-20; I Tim. 3.16b; I Pet. 3.18ff.; Heb. 1.1ff. and John 1.1-14. This means that only a few of the main texts are being used for this inquiry, and that they are not necessarily being understood in their full light. Steps to alleviate this need have been taken by such scholars as R.P. Martin who has studied Phil. 2.6ff. in depth, I-Jin Loh in his dissertation on II Tim. 2.11-13, V.H. Neufeld in his work on the homologia, and others. But the task is enormous. In the Pastoral Epistles alone, the following references may be viewed in part, or in their entirety, as inserted traditional material: I Tim. 1.15; 2.3-6; 3.16b; 6.11ff.; II Tim. 1.9f.; 2.8, 11ff.; 4.1; Tit. 1.1ff.; 2.11ff. and 3.4ff. Attention should be given to these and similar passages - hymns, confessions, prayers, doxologies, benedictions, etc. - before proceeding on to the more general discussions attempting to collate all the evidence thus far not considered.

Third, there is an obvious overlapping both of content and form among the various forms of tradition together with the homologia and kerygma. According to A.R.C. Leaney and O.R.B. Wilson,²³ I.3.16b and the kerygma as summarized by

23. Leaney, The Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon (TBC), London, 1960, pp. 60ff.; Wilson, Op. Cit., pp. 140ff.

C.H. Dodd are very similar.²⁴ But the present writer confesses his inability to note this close connection. While the kerygma stresses the Messianic role of Christ by means of an enumeration of the events of his life, I.3.16b conveys in general terms the idea of his Lordship over both spheres of existence. The former would appear to be addressed primarily to a Jewish audience, while the latter would seem to be directed to an Hellenistic congregation. However, it is interesting to note the similarity to some extent of the use of the aorist tense in I.3.16b and Dodd's idea of 'realized eschatology'. Dodd maintains that the principal cause for the development of early Christian thought was the unexpected delay in Christ's return. This change of events thrust upon the early Christians the necessity of readjusting their eschatological outlook. Rather than sitting back waiting for the immediate return of Christ, they began to realize that they were already 'tasting the powers of the age to come' (Heb. 6.5; cf. Barn. 1.7).²⁵ Does this not also characterize the attitude of the author of I.3.16b in his use of the aorist tense?²⁶

Therefore, there is an urgent need for further clarification of the exact relationship between the various forms of tradition such as I.3.16b and the kerygma. This is why

24. C.H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and its Development, London, 1936 (1963), p. 17. Cf. R.H. Mounce (The Essential Nature of New Testament Preaching, Grand Rapids, 1960) for a more recent discussion of the kerygma.

25. Dodd, Op. Cit., pp. 31ff. Cf. A.M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, London, 1961, p. 18.

26. Supra, 275ff.

the studies by E. Schweizer and R.H. Fuller are so important; for they attempt to make some sense out of the progression of New Testament Christological thought.²⁷ But their works show weaknesses in several areas. First, they would appear to be too general and incomplete, selecting certain passages while excluding a multitude of others. Second, they need to be preceded by further research into the many traditional forms in the New Testament. Third, they mistakenly assume that the less complex always precedes the more complex, that there is always a direct line of progressive development, and that the provenance of the forms is always to be found in pressures of external circumstances. J.N.D. Kelly has shown that these assumptions can often be misleading.²⁸ O. Cullmann

27. Supra, Chap. III, Secs. B. 3 and 4. In brief, E. Schweizer emphasizes the pattern of humiliation and exaltation in all the Christological hymns; R.H. Fuller finds a three-stage progression of thought in the Christology of the NT. - Palestinian-Judaic, Hellenistic-Judaic and Hellenistic-Gentile - and he regards the picture of Christ which appears either explicitly or implicitly in Phil. 2:5ff.; Col. 1:15ff.; I.3.16b; I Pet. 3:18ff.; Heb. 1:1ff. and John 1:1ff. as derived from the Sophia myth, etc.

For a survey of recent studies in NT hymns and confessions, cf. I-Jin Loh, "A Study of an Early Christian Hymn in II Tim. 2:11-13", an unpublished Th.D. thesis at Princeton Theological Seminary, 1968, pp. 2ff.

28. Early Christian Creeds, London, 1950, pp. 24ff. O. Cullman (Confessions, p. 38ff.), H. Conzelmann (An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament, trans. J. Bowden, London, 1969, pp. 87f.) et alii find a progression from purely Christological formulas to bipartite to tripartite confessions. Their view is, in general, that the simple one-clause Christologies represent the earliest expressions, perhaps originating in the Palestinian Church and using the themes of Christ's death and resurrection, etc.; then as Christianity is thrust into the Hellenistic world, more thought is given to the relation of Christ to the Father and Spirit, and the confessions developed accordingly. But J.N.D. Kelly, in the view of the present writer, correctly notes that while certain 'quasi-credal' material in the NT can be catalogued in this way, it does not necessarily follow that they should be viewed according to this progressive

[Contd.]

suggests:²⁹

"We must here be on our guard likewise against arbitrary simplifications. For the early period, we have to admit a diversity of contemporaneous constructions".

Of course, it is not so difficult to criticize another's work. The problem is to replace his suggestions with more suitable ones. This is where further investigation would be justified.

Finally, the relevance of I.3.16b has not been exhausted with the passing of time. The world we live in is still torn apart. The submission of those evil powers which hold men in subjection is not yet complete. The world of harmony and peace centered wholly upon Christ belongs to the end of time. But there is a sense in which we already share in the triumph of Christ over these cosmic forces. We know that the earthly and post-resurrection life of Christ has already made its impact on them, and we wait in anticipation for the day when God will fulfil that which he has begun in Jesus Christ, and will make manifest these truths about which this 'Bekenntnislied' sings.

Contd.] line of development. I.3.16b is an excellent case in point; for while it is purely a Christological formula, it is probably to be considered late and directed to an Hellenistic audience (pp. 14ff.).

Cf. also M. Hengel, "Christologie und neutestamentliche Chronologie", Neues Testament und Geschichte, Oscar Cullmann zum 70. Geburtstag, edd. H. Baltensweiler und Bo Reicke, Tübingen, 1972.

29. The Earliest Christian Confessions, trans. J.K.S. Reid, London, 1949, p. 38.

EXCURSUS I

"The Introductory Statement - I.3.16a"

The author of I Timothy introduces I.3.16b with the statement: καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἔστιν τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον. According to J.N.D. Kelly:¹

"The mention of 'the truth' (v. 15) stimulates the almost ecstatic outburst, 'Yes, beyond all question great is the mystery of our religion'."

This statement, in turn, leads into the form which has been the subject of this thesis.

Various sources have been suggested which may have contributed to the author's use of this terminology. F.D. Gealy finds that this introductory formula was probably a liturgical phrase used in the early Church which the author adapted for his purpose.² J.N.D. Kelly notes the similarity of the phrase with "Great is Artemis of the Ephesians" (Acts 19.28, 34).³ Other verbal parallels in the New Testament have also been found:

II Thess. 2.7 - "the mystery of lawlessness"
 Eph. 5.32 - "great is the mystery...Christ and the Church"
 I Tim. 6.3c - "the teaching which accords with godliness"
 Tit. 1.1c - "knowledge of the truth which accords with
 godliness"

Two of the references just quoted are from the Pastorals which might suggest that the introductory statement is primarily a creation of the author himself. In this regard, it may be

-
1. The Pastoral Epistles (BNTC), London, 1963, p. 88.
 2. The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus (IB, 11), Nashville, 1955, p. 421.
 3. Op. Cit., p. 89. Cf. C. Spicq, Saint Paul: les Épîtres pastorales, Paris, 1969, p. 107.

observed that he frequently uses the noun εὐσέβεια and is familiar with the cognate forms of ὁμολογέω.⁴

However, A.T. Hanson has convincingly argued that the author's use of these terms is due to the influence of 4 Maccabees. Indeed, he suggests that the introductory statement was deliberately copied from 4 Macc.⁵ There is a remarkable similarity to be seen with three passages in 4 Macc. (6.31; 7.16 and 16.1), all of which enunciate clearly the theme of the work: ὁμολογουμένως οὖν δεσπότης τῶν παθῶν ἔστιν ὁ εὐσεβής λογισμός (6.31).⁶ Hanson translates this: "Rational piety is thus demonstrably the master of the passions"?

The similarity is all the more remarkable when one considers that both the adverb ὁμολογουμένως and a cognate form of εὐσέβεια, εὐσεβής, occur in the same phrase. For ὁμολογουμένως occurs nowhere else in the LXX or the New Testament. Concerning εὐσέβεια, Hanson writes:⁸

"Of the four cognates εὐσέβεια, εὐσεβεῖν, εὐσεβής, and εὐσεβῶς, not one occurs anywhere in the New Testament except in Acts, 2 Peter, and the Pastoral Epistles... εὐσέβεια occurs ten times in the Pastorals, εὐσεβεῖν once, and εὐσεβῶς once. The noun is a favourite one of the author of the Pastorals, and exactly the same can be said of the author of 4 Maccabees. Of the fifty-nine occurrences of the word in the LXX, no fewer than forty-seven come from 4 Maccabees..."

It would appear likely, therefore, that part of the terminology of the introductory statement was borrowed from 4 Maccabees.

4. ὁμολογέω - I Tim. 6.12; Tit. 1.16; ὁμολογία - I Tim. 6.12.

5. Studies in the Pastoral Epistles, London, 1968, pp. 21ff.

6. The same phrase recurs in similar form in 7.16 and 16.1, "with ἡγεμών ('leader') and αὐτοκράτωρ ('lord') substituted for δεσπότης in the two passages respectively" (Ibid., p. 22).

7. Ibid., p. 22.

8. Ibid., p. 23.

However, it is one thing to prove that one author used the terminology of another, but another thing to demonstrate that the same connotations are, or are not reflected. In 4 Macc., Hanson contends that ὁμολογουμένως is used both to argue a case and to draw a moral point from the author's argument. However, in I.3.16a, "it functions neither as an adversative nor as a pointer to a philosophical truth", since there is no argument or philosophic discussion taking place in the context.⁹

But this argument does not convince the present writer. I Tim. 3.14-16 (the immediate context) is not just "a pause to remind the reader that this apparently dry legislation has a deeply spiritual purpose".¹⁰ It forms "a bridge between the first part [of the letter], with its instructions about prayer and the ministry, and the practical directions of the second part,...[and] by highlighting the true functions of a church it provides the theological basis for the rules and regulations, as well as for the onslaught on false teaching which make up the body of the letter".¹¹ In the context

9. Ibid., p. 23. He continues: "But that would not matter from his [the author of I Timothy] point of view, it would serve his purpose. His master in moral philosophy had repeatedly written that 'rational piety is demonstrably master of the passions'. He would assert that 'the mystery of piety is demonstrably great'. It sounds like moral philosophy". See also his commentary, The Pastoral Letters (CBC), Cambridge, 1966, p. 46.

10. B.S. Easton, The Pastoral Epistles, London, 1948, p. 135.

11. J.N.D. Kelly, Op. Cit., p. 86. M. Dibelius (Die Pastoralbriefe, Tübingen, 1955, p. 48) calls the passage "ein Zäsurstück", the 'caesura' of the letter, the dividing point of the author's entire argument.

in which it is set, the 'Bekenntnislied' is being used both for confessional and polemical purposes. Confessionally, it stands in apposition to "the mystery of godliness" (and "the truth"), exemplifying the source of 'godly living' which has just been recommended to the leaders of the Church. Just as in 4 Macc., "rational piety is...demonstrably the master of the passions", so in I Tim., Christ is ('demonstrably'¹²) the great "mystery of godliness". Polemically, the hymn stands as "the truth"¹³ which is the possession of the Church against

12. There is some doubt as to the meaning of ὁμολογουμένως in I.3.16a. It was noted above (supra, p. 13 and n. 7) that ~~X~~ G. Dellling and V.H. Neufeld view this adverb as having been intentionally chosen by the author to point to the confessional statement which follows (I.3.16b). O. Michel ("ὁμολογουμένως", TDNT, V, p. 213) agrees: "Perhaps there is here for primitive Christianity an echo of the concept of ὁμολογία". This particular view is supported by later mss. (Codex Bezae, Palestinian Syriac) which read, ὁμολογοῦμεν ὡς - 'we confess that'. Hence, the RSV translation - 'we confess'. This interpretation (if not the variant reading) has been accepted by various commentators, among whom are A.R.C. Leaney, The Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon, London, 1960, pp. 59f.; F.D. Gealy, Op. Cit., p. 421; H.A. Blair, A Creed Before the Creeds, London, 1955, pp. 9f. However, the best mss. read ὁμολογουμένως as one word. A.T. Robertson (An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, London, 1925, p. 151) suggests that the former reading (the variant) is probably due to an unintentional error of sight. Hence, the following interpretations are to be preferred: RV - "without controversy"; Phillips - "No one can deny that"; J.N.D. Kelly (Op. Cit., p. 88) - "by common consent"; NEB - "beyond all question".

If this latter interpretation is accepted - "without controversy", etc. - then ὁμολογουμένως carries with it the suggestion of an adversative in I.3.16a.

13. J.N.D. Kelly, (Op. Cit., p. 87f.) writes: "...the truth (v. 15) stands for the full revelation of God in Christ, but carries the nuance of 'the orthodox faith'. The choice of word here is motivated by conscious opposition to the errorists about to be denounced in 4.1ff." Thus, the 'truth' not only connotes the content of the Christian faith, but it has in the Pastorals the adversative affect of bringing heresy to mind. So we find in the Pastorals (C.K. Barrett, The Pastoral Epistles [NCB], Oxford, 1963,

[Contd.]

false suppositions of piety practiced by those who "depart from the faith" (4.1), and are "bereft of the truth imagining that godliness is a means of gain..." (6.5). Therefore, by using the term ὁμολογουμένως, the author of I Timothy skillfully retains both the confessional and polemical purposes intended for the hymn.¹⁴

Furthermore, it is doubtful that A.T. Hanson's interpretation of εὐσεβείως in I.3.16a should be accepted. He suggests that there is no significant difference between its use in 4 Macc. and that in I.3.16a.¹⁵ However, if it is accepted that the term was borrowed from 4 Macc., what is evident is not the similarity of its use with I.3.16a but the

Contd.] p. 68): "The heretics have 'lost grip of the truth' (I.6.5), have 'shot wide of the truth' (II.2.18), 'defy the truth' (II.3.8), 'stop their ears to the truth' (II.4.4), 'turn their backs upon the truth' (T.1.14)". The atmosphere of opposition evoked by passages using 'the truth' in the Pastorals is very noticeable, and the prevalence of heterodox teaching (I.1.3f.; 6.3) may have been a factor, if not the chief one, motivating the characterization of the Gospel as 'truth'.

Note also the observation of V.C. Pfitzner (Paul and the Agon Motif, Leiden, 1967, p. 177) that εὐσεβεία in the Pastorals is always directed against the heretics. Infra, nn. 14, 18.

14. In other words, we find in I Timothy the following line of thought. Chapters 2 and 3 are devoted to instructions for godly living (2.1 - 3.13). Then, to encourage the bishops, deacons and deaconesses to live godly lives, the author interrupts his theme to remind them of the source of true godliness - Jesus Christ. He emphasizes that the church must uphold 'the truth'. But his very mention of 'the truth' brings to the mind two thoughts. For those who knew 'the truth', even Jesus Christ, there was true encouragement in the following lines (I.3.16b). But 'the truth' also suggested that there were those who did not know the source of true godliness. These were the false teachers, the heretics of the Pastorals, whom he characterized as "teachers of the law, without understanding either what they are saying or the things about which they make assertions" (I.1.7). Hence, the author proceeds in 4.1ff. to direct his attention to them.

15. Studies, p. 23.

contrast. Instead of "God-directed Reason",¹⁶ there is "the mystery of godliness". Instead of being referred to the rational principles of the Jewish Law, we are referred to the person of Christ.¹⁷ Thus, εὐσεβεία in I.3.16a is not a mere synonym for religious practice, something the heretics were wont to do (I. 1.5ff.; 4.1ff.; etc.). It is to be interpreted more in terms of II Tim. 3.12 where the cognate εὐσεβῶς is used: "to lead a godly life in Christ Jesus".¹⁸

Thus, it is likely that A.T. Hanson is correct that the author of I Timothy borrowed the terminology of the introductory

-
16. Unfortunately, A.T. Hanson translates ὁ εὐσεβὴς λογισμὸς "rational piety" (*Ibid.*, p. 22). By doing this, he puts the emphasis on the adjective instead of the noun. It is preferable to translate the phrase with C.W. Emmet (*The Fourth Book of Maccabees*, London, 1918, p. 27), "God-directed Reason", or simply 'pious reason'.
17. C.W. Emmet (*Ibid.*) writes: "The word for Reason is not Logos, but Logismos, a term already in use among the Stoics ...The adjective so translated (God-directed) was also used more or less technically in Jewish writings to denote the Chasidim, or strictly orthodox party of the Law. The phrase "God-directed Reason" therefore, which occurs constantly throughout the book, is well suited to express its special standpoint in the combination of Jewish orthodoxy with the best of Hellenic philosophy".
18. These few comments cannot, of course, claim to have exhausted the meaning of εὐσεβεία (and cognates) nor to have answered the vexing problems which accompany this term in the Pastorals. Various discussions of this term have been contributed: C. Spicq, "Gymnastique et morale d'après I Tim 4:7-8", *Revue Biblique*, 54 (1947) pp. 229ff.; idem, *Épîtres pastorales*, pp. 482ff.; W. Foerster, "Eusebeia in den Pastoralbriefen", *NTS*, 5 (1959) pp. 213ff.; B.S. Easton, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 218 f.; various other commentators. For the present writer, εὐσεβεία in the Pastorals is not understood as a virtue to be perfected; nor does it express merely a pious attitude. It is not founded on the attempt to follow the Mosaic law. Instead, it stands in contrast to the supposed piety of the false teachers (I. 1.5ff.; 4.1ff.; etc.), and is founded in the knowledge of Christ, and is the response of those whose minds are set on him (implied throughout I Tim. 7; 3.15f.).

statement from 4 Macc. However, this is accepted with two reservations. First, he has not convinced the present writer that the same connotations of εὐσέβεια found in 4 Macc. are reflected in I.3.16a. Second, his analysis has left unexplained the origin of μέγα and μυστήριον; and these two terms appear to be pivotal in the introductory statement. They were apparently added by the author himself. His use of μυστήριον may have been deliberate to contrast with λογισμός ('reason') in 4 Macc. Μέγα stands in an emphatic, predicative position, and, together with ἐπαλογουμένως, appears to reflect the author's desire to show the centrality and importance of the ensuing statement (I.3.16b).

EXCURSUS II

"I Timothy 3:16b - Paraphrased and Expanded"

1.

O wie so kündlich groß fürwahr
Bist du, Geheimnis wunderbar!
Der Sohn des höchsten Gottes ward
Im Fleisch uns Menschen offenbart.
Halleluja!

2.

Er trug für uns des Kreuzes Schmach,
Und ward erweckt am dritten Tag,
Zum Siegel deß, daß er der Sohn
Des Vaters in des Himmels Thron.
Halleluja!

3.

Ein Tilger aller Sündennot,
Ein Sieger über Hölle und Tod
Erschien er seiner Jüngerschar,
Der Herr! Das ist gewißlich wahr!
Halleluja!

4.

Und auf dem weiten Erdenrund
Ward seines Namens Ehre kund,
Und aller Welt ward sie zu teil
Die neue Botschaft von dem Heil.
Halleluja!

5.

Die Heiden haben ihr geglaubt,
Die Völker beugten fromm ihr Haupt.
Treu aufgenommen ward das Wort,
Und in den Herzen wirkt es fort.
Halleluja!

6.

Viel tausend Lippen beten an,
Das Erdreich ist ihm unterthan.
Sein ist die Kraft, die Herrlichkeit
Von nun an bis in Ewigkeit.
Halleluja!

- A. Seeberg (Der Katechismus der
Urchristenheit, München,
1966 [first printed,
1903], pp. 124f., n. 1.)

Who in flesh was manifested,
 Pure in spirit attested;
 By angels' vision witnessed,
 Among the nations heralded;
 By faith accepted here,
 Received in glory there!

- A.E. Humphreys (The Epistles to
 Timothy and Titus,
 Cambridge, 1895,
 p. 112).

Who in the flesh was manifested,
 By the Spirit as just attested,
 Oft scanned by angel eye:
 Who 'mong the nations far proclaimed,
 By faithful souls as Saviour named,
 Now reigns with God on high.

- J.P. Lilley (The Pastoral Epistles,
 Edinburgh, 1901,
 p. 112).

In flesh unveiled to mortals' sight,
 Kept righteous by the Spirit's might,
 While angels watched Him from the sky.
 His heralds spread from shore to shore,
 And men believed, the wide world o'er,
 When He in glory passed on high.

- W. Lock (The Pastoral Epistles,
 Edinburgh, 1924, p. 42).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albertz, M. Die Botschaft des Neuen Testament. Vol. I/2. Zollikon/Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1952.
- Alford, H. The Greek Testament. Vol. III. Chicago: Moody Press, 1968. (First published in 1856: London, Gilbert and Rivington, Printers.)
- Amiot, F. The Key Concepts of St. Paul. Trans. J. Dingle, London: Nelson, 1962.
- Anderson, G.W. A Critical Introduction of the Old Testament. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1970.
- Anderson, H. Jesus and Christian Origins: a Commentary on Modern Viewpoints. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Arndt, W.F., & Gingrich, F.W. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1963.
- van Baaren, Th. P. "Towards a definition of Gnosticism". Le Origini dello Gnosticismo. Ed. U. Bianchi. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967, pp. 174ff.
- Badcock, F.J. The Pauline Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews in Their Historical Setting. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1937.
- Baeck, L. The Essence of Judaism. Trans. V. Grubwieser and L. Pearl. London: Macmillan & Co., 1936.
- Barbour, R.S. (A review of R.H. Fuller's The Foundation of New Testament Christology.) Scottish Journal of Theology, 20 (1967), pp. 239ff.
- Barclay, W. The Letters to Timothy, Titus and Philemon. Edinburgh: The Saint Andrew Press, 1965.
- Barr, J. The Semantics of Biblical Language. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

- Barrett, C.K. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Blacks New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957.
- _____. The Pastoral Epistles. New Clarendon Bible Series. Oxford: University Press, 1963.
- Baur, F.C. Die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus. Stuttgart/Tübingen: in der J.G. Gotta'schen Verlagshandlung, 1835.
- Beare, F.W. The First Epistle of Peter. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961.
- Beck, J.T. Erklärung der zwei Briefe Pauli an Timotheus. Gütersloh: Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, 1879.
- Belser, J.E. Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus an Timotheus und Titus. Freiburg im Breisgau: Hendersche Verlagshandlung, 1907.
- Bernard, J.H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John. The International Critical Commentary. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928.
- _____. The Pastoral Epistles. Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge: University Press, 1899.
- Berriman, J. A Critical Dissertation upon I Tim. lll: 16. London: Printed for W. Innys at the West-End of St. Paul's, and J. Nourse at the Lamb without Temple-bar, 1741.
- Bertram, G., & Schmidt, K.L. "Ἑβραίς". TDNT. II, pp. 364ff.
- Best, E. The Letter of Paul to the Romans. The Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: University Press, 1967.
- _____. I. Peter. New Century Bible. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott Ltd., 1971.
- Betz, H.D. "Jesus as Divine Man". Jesus and the Historian. Written in honor of Earnest Cadman Colwell. Ed. F.T. Trotter. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968.

- Bevan, E. Hellenism and Christianity. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1921.
- Bianchi, U. (ed.) Le Origini dello Gnosticismo. Colloquio di Messina, 13-18 Aprile 1966. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967.
- Bieder, W. Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfahrt Jesu Christi: Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Vorstellung vom sog. Descensus ad inferos. Zürich: Verlag Zürich, 1949.
- Bieler, L. esios Avne : das Bild des 'göttlichen Menschen in Spätantike und Frühchristentum. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967. (First published in 2 vols. in 1935-6: Wien, Buchhandlung Oskar Höfels.)
- Billerbeck, P., & Strack, H.L. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. Vol. 3. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928.
- Bisping, A. Erklärung der drei Pastoralbriefe und des Briefes an Philemon. Münster: Verlag der Aschendorff'schen Buchhandlung, 1865.
- Blackman, A.M. "Myth and Ritual in Ancient Egypt". Myth and Ritual. Ed. S.H. Hooke. London: Oxford University Press, 1933, pp. 15ff.
- Blair, H.A. A Creed Before the Creeds. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1955.
- Bleeker, C.J. Egyptian Festivals. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967.
- Boismard, M.-É. Quatre hymnes baptismales dans la première épître de Pierre. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1961.
- Boman, T. Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek. Trans. J.L. Moreau. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1960.
- Bousset, W. Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921.
- Braun, H. "The Meaning of New Testament Christology". God and Christ: Existence and Province. Ed. R.W. Funk. Journal for Theology and the Church, 5 (1968), pp. 89ff.

- Braun, R.A. "Mysterium Pietatis seu in historiam interpretationis Eusebeias vocis Pastoralium Epistolarum, speciatim I Tim. 3,16a inquisitio atque exegetica christologici hymni I Tim. 3,16b explanatio". An unpublished dissertation, Pontificii Inst. Biblici, Romae, 1956.
- Brown, E.F. The Pastoral Epistles. Westminster Commentaries. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1917.
- Brox, N. Die Pastoralbriefe. Regensburger Neues Testament. Vol. VII/2. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1969.
- Brun, L. Die Auferstehung Christi in der unchristlichen Überlieferung. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard), 1925.
- Bultmann, R. "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief". Coniectanea Neotestamentica in honorem A. Fridrichsen. XI. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1947.
- _____. Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting. Trans. R.H. Fuller. London: Thames and Hudson, 1956.
- _____. Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. Trans. K. Grobel. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1968.
- _____. & Luhrmann, D. "Φανερόν". TWNT. Edd. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Vol. 9/1, pp. 4ff.
- Burton, E. DeWitt A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. The International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920.
- _____. Spirit, Soul, and Flesh. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1918.
- Cadbury, H.J. "The Titles of Jesus in Acts". The Beginnings of Christianity. Vol. V. Edd. K. Lake and H.J. Cadbury. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1933, pp. 354ff.
- Caird, G.B. Principalities and Powers: a Study in Pauline Theology. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.

- Cerfaux, L. Christ in the Theology of St. Paul. Trans. G. Webb and A. Walker. New York: Herder and Herder, 1959.
- Chapman, G. "Flesh". Dictionary of Biblical Theology. Ed. X. Léon-Dufour. Trans. under the direction of P.J. Cahill. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1967, pp. 160ff.
- Colpe, C. "Gnosis I. Religionsgeschichtlich". Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Vol. II. 1958, pp. 1648-52.
- _____. Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule: Darstellung und Kritik ihres Bildes vom gnostischen Erlösersmythus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.
- Conzelmann, H. "The Mother of Wisdom". The Future of Our Religious Past. Essays in Honor of Rudolf Bultmann. Ed. J.M. Robinson. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1971.
- _____. An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament. Trans. J. Bowden. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1969.
- Cook, F.C. (ed.) The Holy Bible. Vol. III. London: John Murray, 1881.
- Creed, J.M. The Gospel According to St. Luke. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1957 (first published, 1930).
- Gullmann, O. The Christology of the New Testament. Trans. S.C. Guthrie and C.A.M. Hall. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1963.
- _____. The Earliest Christian Confessions. Trans. J.K.S. Reid. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.
- _____. Early Christian Worship. Trans. A. Todd and J. Torrance. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1953.
- Dahl, M.E. The Resurrection of the Body: a Study of I Corinthians 15. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1962.
- Dalton, W.J. Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits: a Study of I Peter 3:18 - 4:6. Romae: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965.

- Daniélou, J. A History of Early Christian Doctrine Before the Council of Nicaea. Vol. I. The Theology of Jewish Christianity. Trans. and Ed. J.A. Baker. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964.
- Daube, D. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London: University of London - Athlone Press, 1956.
- Davies, W.D. Christian Origins and Judaism. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962.
- _____. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology. London: S.P.C.K., 1970.
- _____. "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit". The Scrolls and the New Testament. Ed. K. Stendahl. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1958, pp. 157ff.
- _____. "Torah and Dogma: A Comment". Harvard Theological Review, 61 (1968), pp. 87ff.
- Deichgräber, R. Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
- Delling, G. "Ἀναλαμβάνω". TDNT. IV, pp. 7ff.
- _____. Worship in the New Testament. Trans. P. Scott. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962.
- Descamps, A. Les Justes et la justice dans les évangiles et le christianisme primitif honnis la doctrine proprement Paulinienne. Louvain/Gembloux: Editions J. Duculot, S.A., 1950.
- Dibelius, M. Die Pastoralbriefe. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Ed. H. Conzelmann. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1955 (first published, 1913; second edition, 1931).
- Dix, G. Jew and Greek: a Study in the Primitive Church. London: Dacre Press, 1953.
- Dodd, C.H. The Apostolic Preaching and its Development. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1963.
- _____. The Bible and the Greeks. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1954.

- Dodd, C.H. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: University Press, 1953.
- D'Oyly, G., & Mant, R. The Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version with Notes, Explanatory and Practical. Cambridge: University Press, 1830.
- Dupont, J. ΣΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩ: L'union avec le Christ suivant saint Paul. Bruges: Abbaye de Saint-André, 1952.
- Durrwell, F.X. The Resurrection: a Biblical Study. Trans. R. Sheed. London: Sheed and Ward, 1960.
- Easton, B.S. The Pastoral Epistles. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1948.
- Ellicott, C.J. A Critical and Grammatical Commentary on The Pastoral Epistles. London: John W. Parker and Son, 1856.
- Emmet, C.W. (ed. & trans.) The Fourth Book of Maccabees. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1918.
- Engnell, I. Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri A.-B., 1943.
- Erdman, C.R. The Pastoral Epistles of Paul. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1923.
- Evans, C.F. Resurrection and the New Testament. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1970.
- Fairbairn, P. The Pastoral Epistles. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1874.
- Fairman, H.W. "The Kingship Rituals of Egypt". Myth, Ritual, and Kingship. Ed. S.H. Hooke. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1958, pp. 74ff.
- Falconer, R. The Pastoral Epistles. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1937.
- Festugière, R.P. La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste. Vol. III. Paris: J. Gabalda et C^{ie}., Éditeurs, 1953.
- Filson, F.V. "How Much of the New Testament is Poetry?" Journal of Biblical Literature, 67 (1948), pp. 125ff.

- von Flatt, J.F. Vorlesungen über die Briefe Pauli an den Timotheus und Titus. Tübingen: Ludwig Friedrich, 1831.
- Foerster, W. "Eusebeia in den Pastoralbriefen". New Testament Studies, 5 (1959), pp. 213ff.
- Fohrer, G., & Wilckens, U. "Σοφία". TDNT. VII, pp. 465ff.
- Frankfort, H. Kingship and the Gods. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Freundorfer, J. Die Pastoralbriefe. Regensburger Neues Testament. Vol. VII. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1959.
- Fuller, R.H. The Foundations of New Testament Christology. London/Glasgow: Collins (The Fontana Library), 1969².
- _____. Interpreting the Miracles. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1963.
- _____. The Mission and Achievement of Jesus. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1963.
- Gadd, C.J. Ideas of Divine Rule in the Ancient East. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.
- Gardiner, Sir A. "The Baptism of Pharaoh". Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, 36 (1950), pp. 3ff.
- _____. "The Coronation of King Haremhab". Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, 39 (1953), pp. 13ff.
- Gaster, T.H. "Angel". The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. I. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Gealy, F.D. The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus. The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. XI. Edd. G.B. Buttrick, et al. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1955.
- Georgi, D. Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief: studien zur religiösen Propaganda in der Spätantike. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964.
- Goodenough, E.R. Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period. Vols. 4 and 12. New York: Pantheon Books, 1953ff.
- Goodwin, J. Divine Wisdom. London: Lutterworth Press, 1963.

- Goppelt, L. Jesus, Paul and Judaism: an Introduction to New Testament Theology. Trans E. Valparaíso. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1964.
- _____. Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times. Trans. R.A. Guelich. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1970.
- Grant, F.C. Roman Hellenism and the New Testament. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962.
- Grant, R.M. Gnosticism: an Anthology. London: Collins, 1961.
- _____. Gnosticism and Early Christianity. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- Greene, W.C. MOIRA: Fate, Good and Evil in Greek Thought. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1944.
- van Groningen, G. First Century Gnosticism: it's Origin and Motifs. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967.
- Gross, H. "Der Engel im Alten Testament". Archiv fur Liturgiewissenschaft. Vol. VI/1. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1959, pp. 28ff.
- Grundmann, W. "Δύναμις". TDNT. II, pp. 284ff.
- Gundry, R.H. "The Form, Meaning and Background of the Hymn Quoted in I Timothy 3:16". Apostolic History and the Gospel. W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1970, pp. 203ff.
- Guthrie, D. The Pastoral Epistles. London: Tyndale Press, 1967.
- Haardt, R. Gnosis: Character and Testimony. Trans. J.F. Hendry. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971.
- Hadas, M., & Smith, M. Heroes and Gods: Spiritual Biographies in Antiquity. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965.
- Hahn, F. The Titles of Jesus in Christology. Trans. H. Knight and G. Ogg. London: Lutterworth Press, 1969.
- Hamilton, N.Q. The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd Ltd., 1957.

- Hanson, A.T. The Pastoral Letters. The Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: University Press, 1966.
- _____. Studies in the Pastoral Epistles. London: S.P.C.K., 1968.
- Hatch, E., & Redpath, H.A. A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal Books). 2 Vols. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1897.
- Helck, W. "Bemerkungen zum Ritual des Dramatischen Ramesseumpapyrus". Orientalia, xxiii, pp. 383ff.
- Hendriksen, W. A Commentary on I and II Timothy and Titus. London: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1964.
- Hengel, M. "Christologie und neutestamentliche Chronologie". Neues Testament und Geschichte: Historisches Geschehen und Deutung im Neuen Testament. Oscar Cullmann zum 70. Geburtstag. Edd. H. Baltensweiler und Bo Reicke. Tübingen: Verlag J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1972.
- _____. Judentum und Hellenismus. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1969.
- Henry, M. An Exposition of the Old and New Testament. Vol. VI. Ed. E. Bickersteth. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1846.
- Héring, J. Le Royaume de Dieu et sa venue. Neuchâtel/Paris: Editions Delachaux & Niestlé, 1959.
- Hervey, A. The Pastoral Epistles Commentary on Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus and Philemon. Pulpit Commentary. Ed. H. Spence. London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1909.
- Heydenreich, A.L.C. Die Pastoralbriefe Pauli. Hadamar: Verlage der neuen Gelehrten-Buchhandlung, 1826.
- Hill, D. Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings. Cambridge: University Press, 1967.
- Hillard, A. The Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul. London: Rivingtons, 1919.

- Hinson, E.G. 1-2 Timothy and Titus. The Broadman Bible Commentary. Vol. XI. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1972.
- von Hofmann, J.C.R. Die Briefe Pauli an Titus und Timotheus. Nördlingen: Druck und Verlag der C.H. Beck'schen Buchhandlung, 1874.
- Holtz, G. Die Pastoralbriefe. Theologischer Handkommentar zum neuen Testament. Vol. XIII. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1965.
- Holtzmann, H.J. Die Pastoralbriefe: Kritisch und Exegetisch Behandelt. Leipzig: Verlag von Wilhelm Engelmann, 1880.
- Hooke, S.H. (ed.) Myth and Ritual. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- _____. Myth, Ritual, and Kingship. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1958.
- Horton, R.F. The Pastoral Epistles. The Century Bible Series. Edinburgh: T.C. and E.C. Jack, 1901.
- Hoskyns, E.C., & Davey, F.N. The Fourth Gospel. Vol. I. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1949.
- Humphreys, A.E. The Epistles to Timothy and Titus. Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge: University Press, 1895.
- Hunter, A.M. Paul and His Predecessors. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961.
- Huther, J.E. Kritisch Exegetisches Handbuch über die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verlag, 1866.
- Jackson, F.J.F., & Lake, K. The Beginnings of Christianity. 5 vols. London: Macmillan and Co, Limited, 1920-33.
- Jamieson, R., & Fausset, A.R., & Brown, D. A Commentary, Critical, Experimental, and Practical, on the Old and New Testaments. Vol. VI. Glasgow: William Collins, Sons, & Company, 1870.
- Jeremias, J. Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus. Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Vol. 9.⁶ Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953.
- _____. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1966.

- Jeremias, J. "Zur Gedankenführung in den paulinischen Briefen". *Studia Paulina*. In honorem Johannis de Zwann. Edd. J.N. Steverster and W.C. van Unnik. Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953.
- _____. Jesus' Promise to the Nations. Trans. S.H. Hooke. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1958.
- _____. & Zimmerli, W. The Servant of God. Trans. drafted by H. Knight, completed by editorial staff of the publishers. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1957.
- Jewett, R. Paul's Anthropological Terms: a Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971.
- Johnson, A.R. Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1967².
- Jonas, H. The Gnostic Religion. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.
- Käsemann, E. "Kritische Analyse von Phil 2.5-11". *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 47 (1950), pp. 313ff.
- _____. Das wandernde Gottesvolk: eine Untersuchung zum Hebräerbrief. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957.
- Kelly, J.N.D. A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1963.
- _____. Early Christian Creeds. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1950.
- _____. The Epistles of Peter and of Jude. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1969.
- Kent, H.A. The Pastoral Epistles. Chicago: Moody Press, 1958.
- Kittel, G., & Grundmann, W., & von Rad, G. "Ἄγγελος". *TDNT*. I, pp. 74ff.
- Kittel, G., & von Rad, G. "Ἀόξα". *TDNT*. II, pp. 233ff.
- Kleinknecht, H. "Φετος". *TDNT*. III, pp. 122f.

- Knoke, K. Praktisch-theologischer Kommentar zu den Pastoralbriefen des Apostels Paulus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verlag, 1889.
- Knox, W.L. "The Divine Wisdom". The Journal of Theological Studies, 38 (1937), pp. 230ff.
- _____. "Pharisaism and Hellenism". Judaism and Christianity. Vol. II. The Contact of Pharisaism with Other Cultures. London: The Sheldon Press, 1937, pp. 61ff.
- _____. Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity. London: Oxford University Press, 1944.
- _____. St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles. Cambridge: University Press, 1939.
- Kremer, J. "Aufgenommen in Herrlichkeit (I Tim. 3, 16)". Bibel und Kirche, XX/2 (1965), pp. 33ff.
- Kroll, J. Die christliche Hymnodik bis zu Klemens von Alexandria. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968 (first published, 1921).
- Kübel, D.R. Die Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus und der Hebräerbrief. Nördlingen: Verlag der C.H. Beck'schen Buchhandlung, 1888.
- Ladd, G. The New Testament and Criticism. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1967.
- Lagrange, M.-J. Saint Paul: Épître aux Romains. Paris: J. Gabalda et C^{ie}, Éditeurs, 1950.
- Leaney, A.R.C. The Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon. Torch Bible Commentaries. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1960.
- Leivestad, R. Christ the Conqueror. London: S.P.C.K., 1954.
- Liddell, H.G., & Scott, R. A Greek-English Lexicon. 2 vols. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Lieberman, S. Greek in Jewish Palestine. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1942.

- Lieberman, S. Hellenism in Jewish Palestine. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962.
- Lietzmann, H. Mass and Lord's Supper: a Study in the History of the Liturgy. Fascicle 3. Trans. D.H.G. Reeve. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1954.
- Lilley, J.P. The Pastoral Epistles. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901.
- Lindars, B. New Testament Apologetic. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961.
- Lock, W. The Pastoral Epistles. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924.
- Loh, I-Jin. "A Study of an Early Christian Hymn in II Tim. 2:11-13". An unpublished Th.D. Thesis at Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey, Submitted 1968.
- Lohfink, G. Die Himmelfahrt Jesu. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1971.
- Lohmeyer, E. Kyrios Jesus: eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2, 5-11. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969 (first published, 1928).
- Longenecker, R.N. The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1970.
- Lund, N.W. Chiasmus in the New Testament: a Study in Formgeschichte. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1942.
- MacCulloch, J.A. The Harrowing of Hell: a Comparative Study of an Early Christian Doctrine. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1930.
- Macdonald, A.B. Christian Worship in the Primitive Church. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1934.
- Macgregor, G.H.C.,
& Purdy, A.C. Jew and Greek: Tutors unto Christ. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson Limited, 1936.
- Mack, M.J. Commentar über die Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus. Tübingen: C.F. Oslander, 1836.

- Manson, T.W. On Paul and John. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1967.
- Manson, W. The Gospel of Luke. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1963.
- _____. Jesus and the Christian. London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd., 1967.
- Marcus, J. "On Biblical Hypostases of Wisdom". Hebrew Union College Annual, 23 (1950-51), Vol. I, pp. 157ff.
- Martin, R.P. "Aspects of Worship in the New Testament Church". Vox Evangelica, Vol. II. Ed. R.P. Martin. London: The Epworth Press, 1963, pp. 6ff.
- _____. Carmen Christi: Phil. 2.5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship. London: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Marty, J. "Étude des textes cultuels de prière contenus dans le Nouveau Testament". Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses, 4/5 (1929), pp. 366ff.
- Matthies, C. St. Erklärung der Pastoralbriefe. Greifswald: Beiernst Mauritius, 1840.
- McKane, W. Proverbs. Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1970.
- Meeks, W.A. (A review of R.H. Fuller's The Foundation of New Testament Christology.) Interpretation, 21 (1967), pp. 188ff.
- Meinertz, M. Die Pastoralbriefe des Heiligen Paulus. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1924.
- Michaelis, W. "Ῥάω". TDNT. V, pp. 355ff.
- Michel, O. "Der Abschluß des Matthäusevangeliums: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Osterbotschaft". Evangelische Theologie, 10 (1950-1), pp. 16ff.
- _____. Der Brief an die Hebräer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936.
- _____. "Ὁμολογουμένως". TDNT. V, p. 213.

- Micou, R.W. "On ὡφθζ ἀγγέλους, I Tim. III.16".
Journal of Biblical Literature, XI/2
(1892), pp. 201ff.
- Moffatt, J. An Introduction to the Literature of the
New Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark,
1918.
- Moore, G.F. Judaism: in the First Centuries of the
Christian Era: the Age of the Tannaim.
3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University
Press, 1927.
- Moret, A. Du caractère religieux de la royauté
pharaonique. Annales du Musée Guimet,
Bibliothèque d'études. Vol. XV. Paris:
Ernest Leroux, Éditeur, 1902.
- _____. The Nile and Egyptian Civilization.
Trans. M.R. Dobie. London: K. Paul,
Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1927.
- Morris, L. The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross.
London: The Tyndale Press, 1955.
- Moule, C.F.D. The Birth of the New Testament. Black's
New Testament Commentaries. Vol. I.
London: Adam & Charles Black, 1966.
- _____. "The Influence of Circumstances on the
Use of Christological Terms". Journal
of Theological Studies, X (1959), pp.
255ff.
- _____. "The Influence of Circumstances on the
Use of Eschatological Terms". Journal
of Theological Studies, XV (1964),
pp. 1ff.
- Moulton, J.H. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol.
III. "Syntax". Ed. N. Turner. Edin-
burgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.
- Moulton, J.H., &
Milligan, G. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament.
London: Hodder and Stoughton, Limited,
1949.
- Moulton, W.F., &
Geden, A.S. A Concordance to the Greek Testament.
Revised by H.K. Moulton. Edinburgh:
T. & T. Clark, 1963.
- Mounce, R.H. The Essential Nature of New Testament
Preaching. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans
Publishing Company, 1960.

- Mowinckel, S. He That Cometh. Trans. G.W. Anderson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959.
- Murray, G. Five Stages of Greek Religion. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1925.
- Neill, S. The Interpretation of the New Testament: 1861-1961. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Neufeld, V.H. The Earliest Christian Confessions. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963.
- Neusner, J. (ed.) Religions in Antiquity. Essays in memory of E.R. Goodenough. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968.
- Nilsson, M.P. Greek Piety. Trans. H.J. Rose. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1948.
- Nock, A.D. Conversion: the Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1933.
- _____. Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964.
- Norden, E. Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971 (first published, 1913).
- _____. Die Geburt des Kindes: Geschichte einer religiösen Idee. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969 (first published, 1924).
- Oepke, A. "Ἀποκαλύπτω". TDNT. III, pp. 563ff.
- Oesterley, W.O.E. An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha. London: S.P.C.K., 1935.
- van Oosterzee, J.J. Die Pastoralbriefe und der Brief an Philemon. Bielefeld/Leipzig: Verlag von Belhagen und Klasing, 1874.
- Parry, R. St. J. The Pastoral Epistles. Cambridge: University Press, 1920.
- Patrick, M. The Story of the Church's Song. Edinburgh: Turnbull & Spears, 1929.

- Perrin, N. (A review of R.H. Fuller's The Foundation of New Testament Christology.) The Journal of Religion, 46 (1966), pp. 491ff.
- Peterson, E. The Angels and the Liturgy. Trans. R. Walls. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964.
- Pfeiffer, R.H. History of New Testament Times: with an Introduction to the Apocrypha. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1949.
- Pfitzner, V.C. Paul and the Agon Motif. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967.
- Plummer, A. The Pastoral Epistles. The Expositor's Bible. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1894.
- Porteous, N.W. "Second Thoughts: the Present State of Old Testament Theology". Expository Times, 75 (1963), pp. 70ff.
- Preiss, T. Life in Christ. Trans. H. Knight. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1954.
- Quispel, G. Gnosis als Weltreligion. Zürich: Origo, 1951.
- _____. "The Jung Codex and its Significance". The Jung Codex: a Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus. Trans. and Ed. F.L. Cross. London: A.R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1955.
- _____. "Makarius und das Lied von der Perle". Le Origini dello Gnosticismo. Ed. U. Bianchi. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967, pp. 625ff.
- von Rad, G. "Ἀγγελος". TDNT. I, pp. 74ff.
- _____. "Ἄδφα". TDNT. II, pp. 233ff.
- _____. Old Testament Theology. 2 vols. Trans. D.M.G. Stalker. Edinburgh/London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962.
- _____. "The Royal Ritual in Judah". The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. Trans. E.W.T. Dicken. Edinburgh/London: Oliver and Boyd, 1966, pp. 122ff.

- Rankin, O.S. Israel's Wisdom Literature: its Bearing on Theology and the History of Religion. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936 (re-printed, 1964).
- Reicke, Bo. The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism: a Study of I Pet. III.19 and its Context. København: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1946.
- Reitzenstein, R. Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen. Leipzig/Berlin: B.G. Teubner, 1927.
- Rengstorff, K.H. Die Auferstehung Jesu. Witten Place/Ruhr: Luther Verlag, 1967.
- Richardson, A. An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961.
- Riggenbach, E. Pastoralbriefe. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1895.
- Ringgren, H. Word and Wisdom: Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East. Lund: Hakan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1947.
- Robertson, A.T. An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1925.
- Robinson, H.W. The Christian Doctrine of Man. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911.
- Robinson, J.A.T. The Body: a Study in Pauline Theology. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1952.
- Robinson, J.M. "Descent into Hades". The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. I. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, pp. 826ff.
- _____. (ed.) The Future of Our Religious Past. Essays in honor of Rudolf Bultmann. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1971.
- _____. "Kerygma and History in the New Testament". The Bible in Modern Scholarship. Ed. J.P. Hyatt. London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1966, pp. 114ff.
- _____. "Logoi Sophon: on the Gattung of Q". The Future of our Religious Past. Ed. J.M. Robinson. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1971, pp. 84ff.

- Robinson, J.M. (ed.) A New Quest of the Historical Jesus. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1968.
- Rowell, J.B. "The Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ Vindicated". Bibliotheca Sacra, 114 (1957), pp. 70ff.
- Rowland, A. The First Letter of Paul the Apostle to Timothy. London: James Nisbet, 1887.
- Russell, D.S. The Jews from Alexander to Herod. The New Clarendon Bible. Vol. V. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- _____. The Sacral Kingship: Contributions to the Central Theme of the VIIIth International Congress for the History of Religions. Studies in the History of Religions. Vol. IV. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1959.
- Sanday, W., & Headlam, A.C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1945⁵.
- Sanders, J.N., & Mastin, B.A. The Gospel According to St. John. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968.
- Sanders, J.T. The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background. Cambridge: University Press, 1971.
- Sasse, H. "Κόσμος". TDNT. III, pp. 868ff.
- Schafer, T.A. (ed.) "Symposium - Studies in Gnosticism". McCormick Quarterly, Vol. XVIII, 1965.
- Schenke, H.M. Der Gott 'Mensch' in der Gnosis. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.
- Schille, G. Frühchristliche Hymnen. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1965.
- Schlatter, A. Die Kirche der Griechen im Urteil des Paulus. Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1936.
- Schlier, H. Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief. Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1966. (first published in 1930: Tübingen; Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]).

- Schlier, H. Principalities and Powers in the New Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 1961.
- _____. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatius-briefen. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1929.
- Schmidt, K.L., & Bertram, G. "ΕΘΝΟΣ". TDNT. II, pp. 364ff.
- Schmithals, W. Die Gnosis in Korinth: eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
- Schmitt, J. Jésus ressuscité dans la prédication apostolique: étude de théologie biblique. Paris: J. Gabalda et C^{ie}, Editeurs, 1949.
- Schneider, B. "Κατὰ Πνεῦμα Ἀγιωσύνης (Romans 1, 4)". Biblica, 48 (1967), pp. 359ff.
- Schneider, J. "Ἀναβαίνω". TDNT. I, pp. 518ff.
- Schoeps, H.J. Paul: the Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History. London: Lutterworth Press, 1961.
- Schrenk, G., & Quell, G. Righteousness. Bible Key Words from G. Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Trans. and Ed. J.R. Coates. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1951.
- Schweitzer, A. The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. Trans. W.A. Montgomery. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1967 (first published, 1931).
- _____. Paul and His Interpreters. Trans. W. Montgomery. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1912.
- Schweizer, E. "Discipleship and Belief in Jesus as Lord from Jesus to the Hellenistic Church". New Testament Studies, 2 (1955-6), pp. 87ff.
- _____. Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern. Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1962.
- _____. Lordship and Discipleship. Trans. with revisions, by the author. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1960.

- Schweizer, E. "Röm. 1,3f, und der Gegensatz von Fleisch und Geist vor und bei Paulus". Neotestamentica. Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1963, pp. 180ff.
- _____. "Σάπξ". TDNT. VII, pp. 98ff.
- _____. et al. Spirit of God. Bible Key Words from G. Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1960.
- _____. "Two New Testament Creeds Compared: I Corinthians 15.3-5 and I Timothy 3.16". Neotestamentica. Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1963, pp. 122ff.
- Scott, E.F. The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930.
- _____. The Pastoral Epistles. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936.
- Scott, R.B.Y. "The Study of the Wisdom Literature". Interpretation, 24 (1970), pp. 20ff.
- _____. "Wisdom in Creation: the 'AMON of Proverbs 8.30". Vetus Testamentum, 10 (1960), pp. 213ff.
- Scott, T. The Holy Bible: Containing the Old and New Testaments, According to the Authorized Version; with Explanatory Notes, Practical Observations, and Copious Marginal References. Vol. VI. London: C. Baldwin, 1844.
- Scroggs, R. "The Earliest Hellenistic Christianity". Religions in Antiquity. Ed. J. Neusner. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968.
- _____. The Last Adam: a Study in Pauline Anthropology. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966.
- Seeberg, A. Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1966 (first published, 1903).
- Selwyn, E.G. The First Epistle of St. Peter. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1949.
- Sethe, K. (ed.) Dramatische Texte zu altägyptischen Mysterienspielen. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1928.

- Sevenster, J.N. Do You Know Greek? Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968.
- Simpson, E.K. The Pastoral Epistles: the Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary. London: The Tyndale Press, 1954.
- Smith, M. "Prolegomena to a Discussion of Aretalogies, Divine Men, the Gospels and Jesus". Journal of Biblical Literature, 90 (1971), pp. 174ff.
- Smith, W.S. "Musical Aspects of the New Testament". An unpublished Thesis at the University of Amsterdam, Uitgeverij W. Ten Have N.V., Submitted 1962.
- Snaith, N.H. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. London: The Epworth Press, 1944.
- von Soden, H. Die Pastoralbriefe. Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament. Freiburg I.B./Leipzig: Akademische Verlagsbuchhandlung von J.C.B. Mohr, 1893.
- Spence, H.D.M. The Epistles to Timothy and Titus. A New Testament Commentary for English Readers. Vol. III. Ed. C.J. Ellicott. London: Cassell Petter & Galpin, 1882.
- Spicq, C. L'Épître aux Hébreux. Vol. II. Paris: J. Gabalda et C^{ie}, Éditeurs, 1952.
- . Saint Paul: les Épîtres Pastorales (Études Bibliques). Paris: J. Gabalda et C^{ie}, Éditeurs, 1969.
- Stacey, W.D. The Pauline View of Man: in Relation to its Judaic and Hellenistic Background. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1956.
- Stanley, D.M. "Carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere...". The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XX (1958), pp. 173ff.
- . Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology. Romae: E Pontificio Institute Biblico, 1961.
- Stauffer, E. New Testament Theology. Trans. J. Marsh. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1955.
- Stendahl, K. "Implications of Form-Criticism and Tradition-Criticism for Biblical Interpretation". Journal of Biblical Literature, 77 (1958), pp. 33ff.

- Stendahl, K. (ed.) The Scrolls and the New Testament. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1958.
- Stenger, W. "Der Christushymnus in I Tim. 3,16: Aufbau - Christologie - Sitz im Leben". Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift, 78 (1969), pp. 33ff.
- Swanston, H.F.G. The Community Witness: an Exploration of Some of the Influences at Work in the New Testament Community and its Writings. London: Burns & Oates, 1967.
- Tarn, W.W. Hellenistic Civilization. London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1927.
- Toynbee, A.J. Hellenism: the History of a Civilization. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Trotter, F.T. (ed.) Jesus and the Historian. Essays written in honor of E.C. Colwell. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968.
- Turner, N. "Syntax". A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. III. Ed. J.H. Moulton. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.
- van Unnik, W.C. "Jesus the Christ". New Testament Studies, 8 (1961-2), pp. 101ff.
- Wace, H. Timothy and Titus. The Speaker's Commentary Series. Vol. III. Ed. F. Cook. London: John Murray, 1881.
- Watson, N.M. "Some Observations on the Use of Αἰκαδῶν in the Septuagint". Journal of Biblical Literature, 79 (1960), pp. 255ff.
- Weiss, B. Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902.
- Weiss, J. Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus: Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1894.
- Weiss, J. The History of Primitive Christianity. Ed. F.C. Grant. London: Macmillan and Co. Limited, 1937.
- Wendland, P. "Hellenistic Ideas of Salvation in the Light of Ancient Anthropology". The American Journal of Theology. Vol. XVII. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1913, pp. 345ff.

- de Wette, W.M.L. Kurze Erklärung der Briefe an Titus, Timotheus und die Hebräer. Leipzig: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1844.
- White, N.J.D. The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus. The Expositor's Greek Testament. Vol. IV. Ed. W. Nicoll. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910.
- Whiteley, D.E.H. The Theology of St. Paul. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964.
- Whybray, R.N. Wisdom in Proverbs: the Concept of Wisdom in Proverbs 1-9. London: SCM Press Ltd.,
- Wilckens, U., & Fohrer, G. "Σοφία". TDNT. VII, pp. 465.
- Wilson, O.R.B. "A Study of the Early Christian Creedal Hymn of I Timothy 3:16". An unpublished Th.D. Thesis at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, Submitted 1954.
- Wilson, R. McL. "Addenda et Postscripta - I". Le Origini dello Gnosticismo. Ed. U. Bianchi. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967, pp. 691ff.
- _____. "Gnosis, Gnosticism and New Testament". Le Origini dello Gnosticismo. Ed. U. Bianchi. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967, pp. 511ff.
- _____. Gnosis and the New Testament. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968.
- _____. The Gnostic Problem. London: A.R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1958.
- Windisch, H. Paulus und Christus: ein biblisch-religionsgeschichtlicher Vergleich. Leipzig: H.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1934.
- Wohlenberg, G. Die Pastoralbriefe. Zahn's Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Leipzig: Böhme, 1906.
- Wolff, H.W. Jesaja 53 im Unchristentum. Berlin: Evangelische Verlage-anstalt, 1950².
- Wuest, K.S. The Pastoral Epistles in the Greek New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Erdman Publishing Co., 1954.
- Zimmermann, H. Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre. Stuttgart: Verlag Kath. Bibelwerk, 1968².